CHRISTENDOM

VOLUME IX AUTUMN, 1944 NUMBER 4

A CHARTER FOR CHRISTIAN YOUTH

WE commit ourselves — individually and in our Christian organizations — to a constant criticism of our own attitudes toward persons of other races in the light of all we know of ove. We pledge ourselves to active effort against the discrimination nd the segregation of any group, Negro, white, of Japanese descent, ew, or any other, wherever our lives touch the question; in our per- onal relationships, in our churches, in schools, in housing, in transpor- ation, and in employment.

We pledge ourselves to think of our suffering brothers around the world, to increase our personal contribution to relief of human agony, ven to the lowering of our own level of living; too, we pledge our- elves to co-operate wholeheartedly with those organizations whose urposes are to eliminate the conditions which give rise to our brother's uffering.

We accept the challenge to reach unreached youth, and to help the hurch to meet its responsibility of becoming instrumental in making troubled world into a Christian world.

We have an awed consciousness of our fellowship with all Christian outh; we are determined together with them in co-operative Chris- ian action, to pour the energies of our lives into the channels of service God opens to us.

(Declaration of the Christian Youth Conference of North America, at Lakeside, Ohio, July 2, 1944.)

THE BRITISH CHURCHES LOOK AHEAD

By CECIL NORTHCOTT

THE war has made the British churches think. The cynic may comment that nothing less than a war would do it! But he would have forgotten that the period leading up to the war was a period of deep discontent for the churches in Britain — a period of distress and much heart searching. The churches were plainly not in a healthy condition and there were many prophets of gloom and despair. But there were also events in that period which affected the life and spirit of the churches, out of which have come many of the noble ventures and prophetic announcements of war-time.

I

For instance the 1924 Conference on Politics, Economics and Citizenship (known as COPEC) was the father of the Malvern Conference, which in 1941 again faced the English churches with the challenge of the Gospel in the common life of man. In the intervening period there had been steady education and propaganda within and without the churches on the same issue. Such organizations as the Industrial Christian Fellowship, the Student Christian Movement, the various organizations which grew out of COPEC (now merged in the British Council of Churches), the social action departments of the churches, and all the many lively societies formed to work for particular reforms, had their effect on the life and experience of the British churches.

Then came 1928–38, the period of the great consultations of Christendom which resulted in Jerusalem, Oxford, Edinburgh, Madras and Amsterdam. These marked a further period of renaissance in British church life. Only a small proportion of the rank and file of church members saw the significance of that period, and news of it is only now infiltrating amongst them. But ministers and groups of laymen centering round William Temple, J. H. Oldham and William Paton (to mention only three leaders) perceived the new life that was emerging, and were eager to irrigate it into British church life. It must be remembered that that period politically was dismal and depressing both in the British and in the international scene. Yet, looking back on it, we see the church re-girding itself in theology, fellowship and in the practice

of the Gospel in the common life. Secular statesmanship was bankrupt, but hope still shone in a reviving church newly aware of its Gospel. I think this point will be a major one in the history of this time, and it must be borne in mind in any judgement of the British churches in the war period. It meant that they entered the war experience far better equipped than at any other comparable moment in their history.

Alongside these hopeful facts must be placed the sad and stern fact that for the last fifty years there has been a steady drift away from the organized life of the Christian church in Britain. It is noticeable in the poor attendances at public worship, but still more noticeable — to the careful observer — in the indifference to Christian judgements and Christian values seen in the common life. The church and the Gospel are an irrelevance and an anachronism to great masses of people. On national and sentimental occasions there is lip-service to Christianity and often a genuine belief that Christianity is the one hope for the world. But the church seems to have little part in this "life and death" business. She is not "dangerous" and "revolutionary" in the sense of Pentecost and the Resurrection and is therefore "by-passed" by those who want a new world, or dismissed as futile by those who expect her to be more decisive and demonstrative than she is.

There is then this lively and hopeful situation in Britain. The inner core of the church is aware of the greatness and the power of the redemptive Gospel. Its life has been scourged and disciplined by war. It is faced nationally by a country which seems indifferent to the church and Gospel and yet which knows them to hold the secret of new life. That will provide for the British churches a tough and intractable missionary problem for many years to come.

In making a judgement about the life of any group of churches it is important to recognize that the clergy and ministers are often years ahead of their people in thought and concern about the living Gospel and church. That is so in Britain. We need a new race of dedicated laymen who see the relevance of the Christian faith and the church as the embodiment of that faith. It will be an important part of the churches' campaign of winning Britain to a more active allegiance to the Christian faith to find those men and women. Without them, humanly speaking, there can be little hope of success. A church which is not claiming the finest in intellect and dedication amongst its lay people is doomed. It may have the ablest ministers imaginable and become a nest of clerical debaters. This burden of a new generation of lay people

is not, of course, a peculiar British problem. But it has its strategic importance for the life of Christianity in Britain. The British people have always been suspicious of the cleric and all his ways, and dislike the brand of authority which often rides in the train of the cleric. But it is also not enamoured by the vagueness of a "lay religion." It wants a judicious mixture in which parson and people are joined in holy company and are both on fire for the Gospel and the church.

II

It is this combination of parson and people which has lent attractiveness to the new British Council of Churches, whose vigorous life since 1942 promises well for the future. Clustered round the personality of the Archbishop of Canterbury this Council also owed much in its beginnings to the late Dr. William Paton. Its most noticeable public program has been in the "Religion and Life Weeks" which, mainly under the Council's stimulus, have been a strong feature of religious life in war-time Britain. They have been held in large and small communities with two aims in view; (1) to present the Gospel in the Common Life of Man, and (2) to demonstrate the Corporate and Co-operative Life of the Christian Church in the Modern World.

"Religion and Life Weeks" work out differently in different places, but their main pattern has five headings on each of which a team of speakers brings to bear the teaching and ethic of the Gospel: Home and Family Life, Education, Social Life and Citizenship, Industry and World Affairs.

The local effect of hundreds of these campaigns conducted all over Britain during the last two years has, of course, varied enormously. In many places the whole community has been stirred by the witness which the campaign has brought, and the churches themselves have been refreshed and stimulated. No one expected that the "Religion and Life Weeks" would begin a "religious revival" (whatever that phrase means), but they have demonstrated the living relevance of the Christian faith, and have also been a witness to the inner unity of the Christian church. They have all been organized by the local churches in close co-operation, including in some instances the Roman Catholic church, and this co-operation has been an incentive to further work together.

It is this common action, both nationally and locally, which gives hope to the British churches as they look ahead to the post-war world.

But co-operation does not mean unity is at hand! Alongside this co-operation there is a marked revival of churchmanship in every communion and a close examination of its inner life. Men of every school of churchmanship are asking themselves about the fundamentals of their life and order, and are returning to the original sources of their priestly and prophetic power. The urge towards co-operation and unity compels this on the one hand. Men must know "where they are" in relation to other communions. But on the other hand the essential nature of the church and its place in modern life demands a clarity in Christian pronouncements. So here is a healthy revival and one which is surely a necessary prelude to a new beginning to the "reunion movement." Any union of the Established and Free Churches is probably far off, but there is now a clearer knowledge of each other's position, and a readiness to co-operate in Christian action on a wide scale.

III

Another instance, and a notable one, of this farsighted co-operation between the churches, is in the field of education. For many years, and especially since the beginning of the century, the Established and Free Churches have had a standing quarrel about education. It originates in the fundamental distinction between them in relation to the state. The Free Churches have opposed the use of public money for the propagation of "sectarian teaching" in the national schools, while the Church of England has maintained many thousands of its own schools, and in many instances has been able to dominate the religious teaching of certain areas. All this has led to much unhappy contention in a very vital part of the national life.

The state did not enter the field of general education until 1870 and from that time there has grown up a "dual system" in education, with the "private enterprise" church system running alongside the state system. Most of the voluntary schools (including the so-called "public" schools) were founded within the Christian tradition and have taught the religion in a very definite Christian atmosphere aided, often, by the residential school method.

But in the "national" schools the teaching of religion has been of an unequal character, and the war has revealed its inadequacy. Recently the government, through an exceptionally devoted Education Minister, Mr. R. A. Butler, has shown its eagerness to have the Christian religion taught systematically in the schools under its control, provided

that the churches and the local authorities concerned could agree on a plan. So there have grown up in Britain in recent years a number of "agreed syllabuses" of religious education based on the Scriptures, and it is on one or the other of these syllabuses that the instruction is to be given within the school curriculum by competent teachers. The best known of these is the Cambridge "Agreed Syllabus" (printed by Cambridge University Press, 3s. 6d.).

The provision of "competent" teachers for this instruction will be an onerous task, and it will offer the churches a great chance to produce the right type of young people who will feel called to the teaching profession with the same dedication as a man feels called to the Christian ministry. Each school day is to begin with an act of Christian worship. There is, of course, a "conscience clause" which allows any parent to withdraw his child, if he wishes, from the school's religious exercises.

The government, under the Bill, has also made generous offers to church bodies (mainly Anglican and Roman Catholic) to help them re-equip their day schools to meet modern conditions. It has rightly set high standards for buildings and equipment; and where a church cannot face the cost (even with the help of a government subsidy) the school is, briefly, to pass into the control of the state and its religious teaching will be provided for under the agreed scheme. It is this point which has caused most discussion with the Roman Catholics.

While the Anglican and Free Churches have been united in support of the Education Bill it would be idle to pretend that there has been enthusiasm for what has been called "the least common denominator in religion," as the basis of instruction in the schools. Many quite rightly say that you cannot teach religion without teaching doctrine about the church. But the answer, and an effective one amongst the general public, is that if we cannot agree about the church and its nature for presentation to the children we must at least include that on which we can all agree. We cannot afford to have a secularized education, and a Britain rapidly losing its elementary knowledge of the Christian Scriptures and the basic things of the Christian faith. Hence the "agreed syllabuses" and a happier household amongst the churches on education than we have had for forty years!

Dr. Temple has called the new education plan a great act of "social justice." The chief feature of that justice is the ultimate raising of the age of leaving school to sixteen for those in the elementary schools. The churches have been working for this for years, — recognizing that a na-

tion which throws seventy per cent of its children into the world at the early age of fourteen (the present age for leaving) is creating an intricate series of problems for itself in social and industrial life. The "clever" child has a host of facilities in Britain's educational world. By the scholarship system he can pass into the universities without cost to his parents. Oxford and Cambridge have been thoroughly democratized by this method. But we have not cared enough for the "ordinary" child who becomes the average citizen. The new Bill makes provisions for him at all stages of his life including the important adult period when so many cease to learn or to develop in their mental and spiritual life. A series of Young People's Colleges is to be set up to which young people in industry and business can come for periods of learning and further study of the things they would like to learn — a plan which owes much in its inspiration to the Folk High Schools of Denmark.

One aspect of the Education Bill, however, will demand constant vigilance on the part of the churches in Britain. Hitherto the President of the Board of Education in Whitehall has been mainly in an advisory character in relation to the local education authorities. But the new Bill authorizes him "to promote the education of the people of England and Wales and the progressive development of institutions devoted to that purpose." That is a capacious directive for the chief education officer of a central government. Many see in it all the dangerous tendencies of a totalitarian authority in a field where power to teach and control is all important. Along with this go some administrative changes which also shift power to larger regions from smaller localities. It is a new step in English methods, but one which is being taken deliberately and with common agreement in the interests of providing the best education for the children. Its challenge to the churches lies in two directions. There must be a new race of dedicated teachers who will see the greatness of their calling, and there must be a new generation of public-spirited men and women who will give of their time and experience in the management of local educational affairs. Only in this way shall we be able to preserve the democratic sense in our new educational plan. The minister himself has already made that plain in commending his Bill to Parliament and the nation.

IV

Over 4,000 churches of all denominations have been destroyed by bombing. If all ecclesiastical buildings, such as schools, convents and

monasteries and adjacent buildings are included, the total damage reaches 14,000 structures for the British Isles. Reconstruction and replanning will present a formidable problem for many years to come. The situation offers the church an opportunity such as it has never had before of rebuilding on a large scale.

The government made it known in the early days of the war that public funds would be provided for the rebuilding of the fabrics of churches destroyed, and negotiations have been going on looking toward an agreed basis of compensation. A committee representing all the churches has been presided over by the Bishop of London, and they have recently reported on their negotiations. For this purpose the word "church" is defined as including, in addition to a church or chapel proper:

(1) Buildings which are under the same roof as the church or chapel, are structurally one with it, and form with it in effect a single building of which they are a subsidiary part, as distinct from buildings of which a church or chapel forms a subsidiary part; or

(2) Buildings (not houses of residence or non-provided schools) essential to the church or chapel for its religious work, and which form with the church or chapel a compact group of buildings making a single unit for that purpose where their sites are not separated by non-ecclesiastical properties or by a public street.

Unlike other property owners, the churches have not been asked to make any payments into the War Damage Fund.

Much discussion has gone on in the Bishop of London's committee about the type of church which should be built, or which should replace those destroyed. The following general rule has been adopted:

Wherever appropriate, the aim should be replacement in the former materials. Where in urban areas the church stood in a prominent position, and where in rural districts it formed an integral feature of the landscape, reconstruction should be in appropriate materials and style to suit its situation. A former tower or spire should be replaced (except where harmony of design may permit substitution of a tower for a spire) although the dimensions of the new tower or spire would be smaller if the new building were itself smaller than the old.

Roof covering should be of as lasting materials as formerly and a pitched roof should not necessarily be replaced by a flat roof; the situation and design of the building should be the determining factors.

Churches of recent and not over-elaborate construction might generally be replaced by similar buildings.

In cases of plain repair, the general formula should be that "patching involves matching." Architectural features of the undamaged portions should be taken into account, and the new plain work harmonize with the old.

Many churches will not be rebuilt on their original sites: provision is made for this in the arrangements with the government. The church concerned will decide about its removal and there will be no government pressure. Public interest such as street widening and town planning will however be a major concern in church building, and one of the provisions agreed on says that "should [the sale of] the old site provide funds both for a new site and a new church, any balance will remain the property of the particular body." While as yet no specific agreements have been made between the denominations to avoid "competition and overlapping" it is generally assumed that rebuilding and replanning will be done in co-operation especially where new areas are involved.

This heavy destruction of church property in Britain provides the church as a whole with a remarkable opportunity to re-equip itself in methods and machinery for its great tasks in the post-war Britain. Many old and redundant buildings, which have been a burden, have been destroyed and their value will result in more modern and more useful buildings. While the strong historic sense in Britain will never allow buildings of beauty and worth to be dismantled yet that fact should not be allowed to weigh unduly against replanning of church property on a major scale. Neither should replanning always be thought of in terms of property. The British churches have a chance now of fulfilling a "living ministry" to the people which may mean more resources invested in a living and mobile ministry rather than in fresh bricks and mortar. One guiding factor governs every piece of replanning — the church must be where people live their family life and where there is a community sense.

It is not likely that the replanning of the churches in Britain will lead to many "united" or community churches. Some of the Free Churches may join together in "union" churches in some localities, as the Baptist and the Congregationalists have already done in some instances. What is more likely is that there may be experiments on the lines of the Coventry Cathedral venture, where a Chapel of Unity with a Christian Centre for all the Christian forces is to be erected in connection with the rebuilding of the Anglican Cathedral. Large sums of money will be required for the furnishing and equipment of the rebuilt churches. Those amounts are not provided for in the government scheme. Some churches, notably the Congregationalists and the Presbyterians, have already collected considerable sums for reconstruction.

V

While organic union of the churches in Britain may be far off, the war has helped them to see more clearly where the dividing lines lie. They lie not so much in the world of Faith, Life and Work, but in the world of Order, and, in that setting, the meaning of the Christian ministry is a paramount one. A great deal of thinking about the authority and validity of the Christian ministry is going on in all sections of the church, and much exchange of history and experience is being offered between the churches. These discussions raise the fundamental questions of doctrine, the sacraments and the regularity of the various Christian ministries, and are doing a great deal to cleanse our thinking and free it from prejudice and inaccurate suppositions. The proposed South India scheme of union has also contributed greatly to this debate, and has compelled British churchmen of all schools to state their position unequivocally.

VI

In all the churches considerable thought is proceeding about the place, recruitment and training of the ministry. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York have had a commission meeting for the last three years. Their report has just been issued (*Training for the Ministry,* Final Report of the Archbishops' Commission. London: Press and Publications Board Church Assembly, 2 Great Peter Street, London S.W. 1. Price 2s. 6d.). Among the more important recommendations is one which supports the idea of "interdenominational theological faculties" in the modern universities. If this is not found possible, the idea of a Christian centre is supported "at which students of whatever denomination could meet for worship and discussion." Already in the older universities of Oxford and Cambridge the theological faculties, both in the universities and in the seminaries associated with the universities, work very closely together, and in Cambridge one of the great divinity professorships, hitherto the exclusive preserve of the Anglican church, is held by Dr. C. H. Dodd, a Congregationalist. Cambridge too has led the way in asking Free Churchmen to preach the University Sermon in the University Church of St. Mary's — another instance of the less exclusive spirit in the Anglican church.

Whether all this may lead to the establishment of interdenominational seminaries on the American plan is hardly predictable. In some

ways the British Student Christian Movement has provided that intercourse of fellowship and experience for ministers of all denominations in their student days, which many Americans find valuable in their seminaries. But many in Britain are beginning to feel that the establishment of interdenominational seminaries would do a great deal for the intercourse of the churches, and would provide some of the modern universities with religious life and centres which they so badly need.

The Archbishops' Commission on this point says:

> The modern university is mainly a secular institution: its studies are highly specialized and predominantly scientific. It will be difficult to plan satisfactorily for the place of religious studies in university life until this tendency is balanced by the provision of a more adequate general background for specialist courses. If and when this is done, we believe that the general interests of education will be greatly advanced, and we may hope that the establishment of additional theological colleges in university centres will tend to strengthen the position of theology in the universities, and to stimulate the planning of this more integrated training.

Two other recommendations of this Commission are of wider interest than to the Anglican Church alone. One supports the suggested establishment for the Anglican Church of a "Central College" for "selected leaders among the clergy or laity of regional Churches of the Anglican communion overseas." This would be a kind of "staff college" for the Anglican Church where the whole of its life and work could be surveyed in relation to the world-wide church.

The other recommendation proposes

> an institution for post-ordination training and research to further the work of the British Council of Churches and of the ecumenical movement. . . . We need to consider with other Christian bodies how best we can co-operate at home and abroad. . . . This requires that clergy and ministers should engage in it together as members of a society, with full opportunity for study and discussion. We contemplate a college numbering twenty-five members.

The report of the Archbishops' Commission is evidence of the nice balance of tradition and experiment which characterizes the Anglican Church. But it is also evidence of the broadening and deepening effect of the ecumenical movement on Anglican thought in relation to the ministry. Much that is said about the minister's vocation, the type of man required for the modern ministry, the pastoral relationship of parson and people which has been one of the glories of the English church, applies equally to all British churches, and might well be heeded by churches everywhere.

This article is an imperfect attempt to present something of the life and experience of the British churches as they have come through the years of war. I cannot close it without a word of admiration for the "ordinary people" of the British churches who, humanly speaking, have maintained church life during these years of testing. We gird at and criticize the rank and file so often. Let us now salute them. They have prayed and worshipped, given and sacrificed, in face of disaster and in the midst of death. I think in particular of their magnificent giving to "foreign missions." Every great British missionary society has a tale of glory to tell of the devotion and care of those who within the churches (though small in number) have believed that Christ and his Church are for the whole world and have provided the resources for that witness without falter. It is that story as much as anything in the war-time experience of Britain that gives me personal hope for the future and the part the British churches will play in it.

CHURCH ORDER AND THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE

By THEODORE O. WEDEL

WHENEVER an ecumenical discussion takes place, it is usually not long before the problem of the ministry becomes a topic of debate. No Christian church would place its own doctrine of the ministry exactly at the head of its doctrinal system of belief. Neither bishops, nor priests, nor deacons, nor presbyteries and synods, are mentioned in the classic creeds — a fact which should be of some importance. Yet Christian unity demands more than oneness in basic faith. It demands sacramental corporate expression. The "Breaking of Bread" antedates, as a symbol of church life, New Testament or formalized creeds. It is the fundamental act of Christian fellowship. Breaking of bread together implies some kind of church order. Someone must actually *break* the bread for the Family of God. Belittlement of the problem of church order belittles the Church of God.

The corporate act of tablefellowship is, indeed, one of the undervalued but important clues to an understanding of the problem of church order and of the grievous controversies surrounding it. The Holy Communion is a common denominator even today in all church orders, however diverse they may appear on the surface. An observer, freed from controversial prejudice, might surely be more than a little amazed at the uniformity which still underlies the apparent chaos of church orderings since the Reformation.

Take Congregational church order as an example — or better that of Independency generally, since this could include a number of denominations which have the congregational theory of church polity in common. Every such independent congregation still has a minister. He is "breaker of bread" for the Christian "gathered" group, fulfilling, in addition, such other functions as naturally fall to the presiding father of a family united in tablefellowship. For the sake of analogy with more complex church orders, let us give to such a minister the generic title of "bishop." This is not absurd, since many a second-century Christian bishop may well have ruled over not more than a single congregation. Our Congregational bishop fulfills in the "Little Church"

many, if not most, of the functions which the Catholic bishop of traditional church order exercises in the "Great Church." Independency is Catholicism reduced in scale.

This analogy between Little Church and Great Church is valid and important. The "bishop" of the Little Church, for example, was not created merely by a single congregation, however much the independent flock may have determined his election and call. Even in Independency the minister is ordained by other ministers — normally by at least three other "bishops," who, in their turn, have similarly received denominational rather than merely local orderings and thus stand in an historic succession. This succession is not recognized by Catholic churches; it is often not very much valued by Independency itself; it may even be belittled or almost denied in doctrine. But it is still there in practice and may mean more to Independency than official pronouncements reveal. The congregation, after it has received its "bishop," may be independent enough. But it is still dependent upon other congregations to secure a minister in the first place. Is it fanciful to see in each denominational church ordering a reduplication, in miniature, of the episcopal system of the church of Catholic history? I think not. The breakup of Catholic Christendom into sectarianism has not destroyed all similarity of structure. It has, however, broken it into smaller fragments. The diocese has become the congregation. The Great Church has become a congeries of Little Churches.

Another analogy, as well as difference, between Great Church and Little Church deserves mention. Every church in Christendom has both a church order and a church polity. The term "church order" describes the basic structure of flock and shepherd. This is carried on or transplanted by a ministerial succession, and a sacramental rite of ordination. The units in this structure, however, are on a footing of equality with one another. In Congregationalism, each congregation is independent. In Catholic tradition, each diocese, under its bishop, is similarly independent. Unification of the separate units is brought about by some form of "political" government. This government takes shape in endlessly varied political creations — synods, assemblies, general conventions, church councils. Analogies exist between Catholic and Independent and Presbyterian government. All superimpose upon congregational or diocesan church life, government by legislating corporations.

The similarity, however, is balanced by a notable contrast. Catholic church life gives to organic church order a far larger control than do

the denominational Little Churches. The difference consists in the size of the unit. In Catholic church life, this is the diocese. The bishop is himself already a unifying *persona ecclesiae*. The independence of the local congregation has already been transcended by way of church order itself. The bishop is shepherd of an already unified flock. The local minister wields a derivative, not independent, authority. This difference is of momentous importance. History can prove how episcopal church order (I use the term now in its proper historical sense by which bishop means diocesan Father-in-God) has been an amazingly effective check upon schism. Schisms there have been, to be sure. But, even when schism has occurred, similarity of organic structure has remained untouched.

The fundamental structure of church order is that of tablefellowship. Each Holy Supper anywhere in Christendom and throughout the Christian centuries has required a breaker of bread — a functional "bishop." Congregation with "bishop" is a cell of the Body of Christ. It should be, according to New Testament doctrine, the whole Church of Christ manifested in a local assembly. It is conceivable that Catholic Christendom might have developed by maintaining this cellular structure, expressing its catholicity politically, rather than organically, in a Presbyterian or other constitutional form. Instead, Catholic Christianity developed a more complex organic structure — the diocesan episcopate. Most Protestant churches (Presbyterian church order partly excepted) have reverted to a more primitive form. In doing so, they lost an organic bond of unity. They substituted the denomination.

If any phenomenon in church order is a real doctrinal puzzle, it is the denomination. Just what is it? It isn't "the Church of God which is in Corinth" (1 Corinthians 1:2) or "the Church of God which is in Chicago." It isn't a diocese. It symbolizes a doctrinal, not a geographic schism in the Body of Christ. Denominationalism does not mean that the Church in Chicago is out of communion with the Church in Detroit, though that might be tragic enough. It means that one group of Christians in the Church of God in Chicago is out of communion with other Christians in the same Church of God in Chicago. To a denominationally divided Church, St. Paul's words could literally apply: "Every one of you saith, I am of Paul and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided?"

Charles Clayton Morrison, in his book *What is Christianity?* (Willett, Clark, 1940, p. 242), is right in accusing denominationalism of losing the New Testament doctrine of the Church as One and Catholic.

Yet he makes an important concession. "In congregationalism the church exists in the cell, not in the organism." A cell, too, is still an organic, not an inorganic, structure.

Congregational church order is a test case, since the more churchly types of denominationalism (Presbyterian, Lutheran) already have a structure at least approaching Catholic church order. The question arises then: Is "the Church existing in the cell" not still the Church? Does it differ in kind from the Church in a more complex corporate form? Does the "breaker of bread" for the cell-Church differ in kind from the minister in a congregation under a diocesan bishop? Biological metaphor is inescapable here. Episcopal church order, let us say, is vertebrate; denominational church order invertebrate. Granted that this constitutes a very important difference. But, dogmas of succession apart (we shall have to wrestle with these shortly), is this a difference which prevents all mutual recognition? Is it not a difference partly of mere relative organic complexity? Might not a minister in a cell-Church receive recognition by an episcopally ordered Church in some way short of reordination? Or, if reordination were pragmatically acceptable, would this mean creating a ministry *de novo?* Does not the Great Church — or better, the "Greater" Church, since the Great Church, too, is in fragments — need the cell-Church, as the cell-Church, in its turn, needs organic connection with the Church historic and universal? Denominations are more and more recognizing each other's ministries, but is not this recognition one of courtesy? Is not a church order needed which will give even such interdenominational recognition outward and visible expression? Each denomination still has *organic* unity within its own borders; recognition of a minister is not by courtesy, but by corporate ordination. Is any ecumenical Church achievable except by extension of such organic forms of recognition? And is not episcopal church order such a form? Its unit is the diocese and not the single congregation. It permits the Church of God in Massachusetts, or Ohio, or California to be a corporate reality — all Christians in communion with one another because all are in tablefellowship with a *diocesan* breaker of bread, the bishop.

II

To unite these differentiated organisms may require delicate ecclesiastical statesmanship. The ministry of the cell-Church cannot be equated offhand with the more complex structure of the Greater

Church, nor can the two ministries be immediately interchanged. All such problems are, however, capable of solution provided the two church orders can reorganize each other as both true ministries of the people of God. Recognition is the hurdle. The only real divisive force in the Christian family of God is heresy. When community of basic faith in Christ ceases, tablefellowship must cease. The church order of the second century grew up precisely as a protection against heresy. The Reformation break with Catholic church order was first of all a theological break. Separate and distinct church orderings were a result, not a cause. The problem of doctrinal unity in the Church is prior to that of tablefellowship. The emergence of sectarianism since the Reformation was a witnessing to a deep conviction that the Church was a community of common faith, not a mere legal institution.

But this witness to the importance of doctrine need not be pursued to the point where every article of faith requires a separate community as corporate embodiment. The momentous ecumenical fact of our time is the rediscovery of a community of faith across scores of once sharply drawn denominational boundaries. The old disputes of our forefathers are being dissolved in a new ecumenical brotherhood. A hunger for tablefellowship is infecting Reformation Christendom. Surely organic union, too, is written in the stars.

III

And why not mutual recognition, the acceptance of a community of faith? One doctrinal difficulty stands in the way. It is the doctrine, indigenous to Catholic church order, of apostolic succession. Subsidiary to this doctrine is that of the Catholic priesthood. No episcopal church order, like that retained in Anglicanism, can become a party to any reunion plan unless it has made its peace with this doctrine. Apostolic succession is, for many who live under episcopal church order, their most precious possession. Many Anglicans cannot yield this without agony of conscience. Perhaps they cannot yield it at all. Members of non-episcopal churches can little realize how even the suspicion of surrender arouses in large groups of Anglicans a shudder of fear for the safety of the most precious heritage of their faith in the Church of Christ. The subject requires reverent discussion.

Ministerial succession, as has been pointed out before, is a fact in all Christian church life. Every denomination guards a succession today. No cell-Church lives utterly to itself alone, either in space or in time. It

has a corporate, organic link with other Christian flocks. Succession symbolizes such a link across the barriers which separate passing generations. A vocation is laid upon such a succession. It is charged with preserving purity of doctrine, with maintaining a tradition of custom and moral code. It is the conserving structure within the whirl of change which threatens every social body. Every sect holds precious its organic links with its founding fathers.

Why should such succession be denied the early Church? And why should this succession be denied the descriptive title "apostolic"? Here, to be sure, the critical historian may prick a few bubbles. To trace all ministerial successions in the first centuries to one of the original twelve disciples is clearly impossible. Nor is there the slightest evidence that the apostolic college as such long perpetrated itself.

But give to apostles, or to "apostolic men" the functional definition of missionary founders of the early churches in the Roman world and the picture comes clear. These are the missionary begetters of churches — churches each with local church officers. The Founder travels to new lands. The local church must now lead an autonomous life. Replenishment of officers must now take the form of a local succession. This is still the manner in which many a church begins its life on the missionary field today. And if apostolic succession means tracing the successions in Christian history to the Founders of churches in the apostolic age, who should wish to disprove such historic ministerial genealogy or to belittle the fact that it was held precious and preserved in memory.

A doctrine of an historic ministerial succession traceable back to the apostolic age is, however, not quite what the Catholic means by the doctrine of apostolic succession. But before defining this doctrine in its Catholic meaning, the story of the rise of episcopacy should be brought on to the scene.

Two theories of the rise of episcopacy mainly hold the field today. One was for long regarded as established by Bishop Lightfoot in his celebrated *Dissertation on the Christian Ministry* (in the Appendix to his commentary on Philippians). According to this, "bishop" and "presbyter" were originally synonymous. Churches were at first governed by colleges of presbyter-bishops. Rule by a single bishop emerged out of this earlier more democratic rule. The theory seems to fit many, if not most, of the New Testament allusions to bishops and elders.

A second more recent theory, however, is even simpler and seems to

explain the same facts. This theory sees the rise of episcopacy in the liturgical life of the early Church. The New Testament utilized many ministries of the Spirit, from prophecy to ruling. At the heart of Church life, however, was its central cult-act, the Holy Supper. This required a president, a breaker of bread. In imitation of the Last Supper, this president, representing Christ, was seated at the holy table, with elders, representing the Apostles, sitting at his left and his right. The names of such scholars as Sohm and Harnack are associated with this theory. It is conveniently and persuasively argued in Walter Lowrie's *The Church and Its Organization,* Longmans, 1904, and in the same author's *Problems of Unity,* Longmans, 1924.

This picture of the central cult-act of the early Church also explains the meaning of the subsidiary ministries of presbyters and deacons. The deacons were the table-servers. The presbyters were the "elders" of the parish who naturally were accorded the honor of the chief seats at the holy table. The bishop's position, however, was *unique.* A college of presbyters could not replace him. The presbytery might, indeed, exercise collective advice and rule, with the bishop as chairman. "Shun divisions," says Ignatius, "as the beginning of evils. Do ye all follow your bishop, as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and the presbytery as the Apostles" (*Ad Smyrn.,* par. 8). This early ministerial ordering was congregational — a cell-Church. A modern Independent church has some right to boast that it reduplicates this primitive structure. Presbyter and bishop were by no means the same, any more than minister and elders are the same today in a Presbyterian church. The *name* bishop may not always have been used. A bishop may have been called simply "elder," since he was obviously chosen from among the trusted older men of the parish. His function, not his name, was unique, and marked him as the symbol of unity, around whom tablefellowship centered. An analogous ambiguity of name, though not of function, still surrounds the words elder, presbyter and bishop in Presbyterianism today.

Congregational church life, however, soon faced the problem of subdivision. Assemblies of Christians in a city or region grew too large to preserve tablefellowship in a single place. What happened? Ignatius can again furnish a clue. "Let that be held a valid eucharist," he says (*Ad Smyrn.,* par. 8), "which is under the bishop or one to whom he shall have committed it." A natural deputy would be one or more of the elders. Their serving in the bishop's place, however, was by way of a de-

rivative authority. The bishop's chair remained in each sub-assembly. We know from the account of things in Rome in the third century that when the bishop was absent, a presbyter could not celebrate the eucharist until he had received a particle of the host from the assembly where the bishop himself was present. (Walter Lowrie, *Problems of Unity*, p. 268.) The bishop remained the center of unity of the greater Christian assembly, a fact symbolized in his retention of the power of ordaining presbyters as his deputies.

IV

What has this development, an inquirer may ask, to do with apostolic succession? In one sense, the growth of diocesan episcopacy was most truly a succession from the Apostles. The bishop was guardian of the apostolic tradition of Gospel truth. He was the personalized center of the community of faith — a faith going back to the apostolic deposit. He was a protector of his flock against heresy. The New Testament gradually was accepted as a deposit of apostolic witness, and became the chief witness later in Reformation churches. But in the early Church, the ongoing corporate life of the community was another witness. Only thus could heresy be kept at bay. Every community of believers in later church history, as a matter of fact, has trusted a corporate ministerial succession for safeguarding its precious store of tradition. And the episcopate as an organ of continuity and diocesan unity was marvellously fitted to perform the function of preserving the church through the stormy generations of heresy.

It will be noted, however, that the conception of succession we have described thus far is still an historical one. It was pragmatic and concerned with preserving a tradition of doctrine. The term historic episcopate may well be used to define it. Nor do I see why it should cause a modern evangelical Protestant any doctrinal qualms. Ministerial succession — episcopal succession, if you will — could still be defined as a succession of vocation and of function. It was handed on from bishop to bishop, but only as an authority and a calling given by the Spirit-indwelt corporate body. Validity was not yet thought of as dependent upon a peculiar "grace of orders" monopolized in a succession over the head, as it were, of the church. In Ignatius or Irenaeus nothing is said of a succession bound up with any special form of ordination or appointment. Instances can be cited of a presbytery ordaining its own bishops (as in Alexandria). (Walter Lowrie, *op. cit.*, p. 238.) The rule

requiring three bishops to ordain another bishop was made universal only at the Council of Nicaea. Succession, indeed, is not necessarily tied up with ordination — as the succession in the Roman papacy illustrates.

Just when a view of apostolic succession "in the sense of a share in specific apostolic grace, communicated *ex opere operato,* as through material channels, from one bishop to another, in virtue of certain bodily acts and sacrosanct formulae" became general in the Church, I must leave to historians. (See James Vernon Bartlett, *Church Life and Church Order,* Oxford, 1943, p. 93.) It is, in some forms, apparently as ancient as the third century, and has grown in definiteness ever since.

The Oxford Movement, launched by Newman and his friends a hundred years ago, was founded upon an uncompromising reassertion of this doctrine. The very first Tract of the series which began the Oxford Movement, and written by Newman, says: "The Lord Jesus Christ gave His Spirit to His Apostles; they, in turn, laid their hands on those who should succeed them; and these again on others; and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present Bishops, who have appointed us as their assistants, and in some sense representatives."

There, condensed into a single sentence, is the Catholic theory of the ministry. The most important clue to its doctrinal significance is what it says of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is no longer, as clearly in the New Testament, a corporate possession of the whole Body of Christ, but a gift monopolized by and in a ministerial succession. Episcopate and priesthood (the two go together in a Catholic doctrine of the ministry) are, in rigorist Catholic theory, a channel of divine power unrelated, so it might appear, to the corporate life which they serve. They are independent of it, or at best parallel to it, receiving their power, if succession is added to the picture, from a quasi-legal commission from Christ himself and maintained in an autonomous sacerdotal caste.

Accept this view of the ministry and of succession, and the whole Catholic structure of church life logically follows. Sacraments become dependent for their efficacy on the ministry alone. They, too, convey a legally sanctioned grace, — a grace endangered if the slightest flaw occurs in the genealogy of the sacerdotal succession. Hence the problem of validity leaps to a position of paramount importance. The horizontal schism between priesthood and people is complete. Apostolic succession becomes the *esse* of the church. Protestant ministries are simply not ministries endowed with priestly powers or the gifts of the

Holy Spirit. Protestant sacraments become invalid, including that of Absolution in the Confessional. The Council of Trent is then justified in declaring of the Eucharist: "This sacrament no one can effect, unless a priest who has been duly ordained, according to the keys of the Church, which Jesus Christ Himself granted to the apostles and their successors."

Here we are at the great watershed of the doctrine of the ministry — as indeed, of the Church of Christ. I have argued in behalf of the historic episcopate. But unless a view of episcopal church order can extricate itself from this sacerdotal dogma of apostolic succession and priesthood, its rejection by evangelical Christendom is foreordained. This theory of the ministry a Biblical Protestantism will never accept. Whether it may remain as a permissive view in an ecumenical Christianity may be a question referred to future ecumenical charity. But a threat of its dominance will wreck any reunion movement in which a Reformation church is to share.

For the sacerdotal theory of apostolic succession denies the Church of God. A schism between priesthood and people is accepted as of the essence of the Church and is read back to the authority of Jesus himself. The New Testament as a whole is against sacerdotalism. Nowhere is priesthood ascribed to an individual. Christ is the only High Priest and the corporate people of God the only priesthood. (Hebrews 5:7; I Peter 2:5, 9; I John 2:1.) That such priesthood can be represented by the ministry should be, of course, accepted. Fear of Catholic error has undoubtedly kept a full expression of the ministry's priestly representation of the Church in check in Protestantism. Remove the fear, and a rich area of rediscovery is disclosed to view. A remarkable volume describing such possible rediscovery of Catholic emphases in an evangelical ministry is *The Mystery of God* by Wilhelm Stahlin, S.C.M., 1937.

As soon as the ministry, however, is planted once more in the soil of the corporate life of the people of God, it becomes functional and truly an organ of the Body and of the Spirit dwelling in the Body. Sacraments cease to be suspected of magic. Priesthood becomes a service in the Church's corporate sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. Church and ministry have never been really separated, and should not be. Yet if we wish to understand the Reformation revolt, it must be seen, in part, as a revolt of the Christian people of God against sacerdotalism. *And the people-Church survived.* It lost organic unity in the revolt. It lost some of its organic links with the Church of history. But the Refor-

mation churches may have demonstrated that the Holy Spirit cannot be a monopoly of a ministerial caste. The cell-Church can live and even create ministries — ministries which the historic churches are forced to recognize as at least functionally efficacious, even while they defy the logic of theories of succession or validity. "It is the living body," says William Temple, "which gives authority to its Orders; it is not the possession of valid Orders which gives authority to the body." (*Church and Nation,* p. 195.) This truth the Reformation churches may have proved for all time.

And the Reformation churches may have recovered for us also the true meaning of the word "apostolic" in the creeds and in any succession theories. Calvin indulges in no argument against bishops as such. For the episcopal government of the early Church, he has nothing but respect. But the doctrine of authority resting merely upon a ministerial succession meets with scorn. Authority lies in true doctrine and doctrine must be apostolic. Seen from the perspective of the centuries of atomized Protestantism, one can easily criticize the Reformers for their blindness in thinking that doctrine would suffice as a substitute for an institutional church structure. But the Reformers' revolt can be a warning to any succession theory that a mere impeccable genealogical tree is no proof that the ministry is an apostolic ministry. It must be apostolic in function. It must preserve apostolic truth. To rediscover the meaning of the ministry in terms of its function rather than in terms of legal validity may have been one of the blessings which the Protestant era of divided Christendom will bequeath to the ecumenical Church of the Future.

V

The doctrine of apostolic succession in its sacerdotal Catholic form must go. But does this negative judgment apply to the historic episcopate? Free the argument for the historic episcopate from theories of sacerdotal monopoly. Plant episcopal church order once more in the evangelical soil of the people-Church. Make it a functional organ of the Body of Christ in time and in space. Can it then make a plea for itself?

I ventured earlier to identify functionally the breaker of bread in the cell-Church with the breaker of bread in the larger diocesan church. Both are functional "bishops," and in the earliest period of church history were as yet little differentiated. To superimpose upon

the Little Church once again the more complex order of the Great Church demands a humbling of prerogative on the part of the ministries of the Little Churches. In Presbyterian Church polity, the presbyter is already called "bishop in the Church of God." The historic Episcopal church order asks him to relinquish this title! In asking for this sacrifice, the church order of the historic episcopate has a great burden of courtesy and Christian charity placed upon it.

I shall not propose concrete solutions. These must be left to ecumenical statesmanship. If episcopal church order is to win ecumenical acceptance, it will have to do at least three things: First, the Catholic sacerdotal doctrine of apostolic succession must be surrendered. At the very least, it can remain only as a merely permitted theory. Secondly, in some unmistakable way, recognition must be given to non-episcopal ministries as true ministries in the Church of God. Thirdly, the historic episcopate must be defined in ways which will make it acceptable to evangelical conscience. By way of pragmatic arguments for it as an organ of unity in the Great Church, I have probably said enough in earlier paragraphs. A functional order approximating that of a Father-in-God over a presbytery is already emerging in many a denominational church polity. Episcopal church order, even though it be at first in denominational, not diocesan, form, is beginning to make its way in ecumenical imagination. But what about the *historic* episcopate?

VI

We are dealing here, I must admit, with a mystery — the mystery of time, the mystery of history, the mystery of God, the Lord of time. The Christian flock must be one flock here and now. A bishop as breaker of bread can be the center of unity. It was for this functional and liturgical reason that the episcopate (congregational and then diocesan) arose. But the Christian flock must be one in time also.

No Christian Church has ever dared to deny its continuity with the people of God in history. Overtones of meaning still surround the credal words "One," and "Catholic" and "Apostolic" in every Christian confession. And links with the Church of the past exist in many forms. The Catholic, with his emphasis upon apostolic succession, is in danger of ignoring some of these. The Bible, surely, is one such link — possibly the greatest. The liturgical traditions of the Christian flock are another. Prayers repeated for thousands of years in a communion of saints are a channel of spiritual power that no merely contemporary

devoutness can rival. Christian doctrine, witnessed to by generation upon generation, becomes embedded in the very subconscious of the mind of a church. Can there not be still another such link with the Church of history which is personal — an historical ministry?

The dread word succession meets us here. The historic episcopate is a succession. Though its origins in the apostolic era may be obscure, and its monopoly of apostolic grace denied in any sacerdotal sense, it is still there as an historic fact. It may be well nigh impossible for a Catholic to divorce the historic fact from theories of validity and from genealogical pride. The non-Catholic may see the fact in more neutral perspective. Yet with all reservations, may not an historic personal link with the Church of history have great meaning? Here is a structure of church life which has lasted from the early centuries. It is the structure of the Church of the East. It is, though overlaid with later growth, the structure of the Church of Rome. It symbolizes, to those who live in it, the Great Church of Christian history.

The problem of an ecumenical ministry is not one of creation, but of recognition. The ministries are here — in cell-Churches, in denominational orderings, in national churches (Sweden is a good example), in great Catholic churches like those of the Orthodox East and of Rome. There is need of an organ which can symbolize unity and continuity and, above all, of mutual recognition. Recognition can come by courtesy, as it has already come across many denominational boundaries. But is Catholic conscience wholly wrong when it feels that this is not enough? The reason why it hesitates to accord recognition without some sacramental symbolizing of that recognition is surely not mere arrogance or pride. Even in law a denomination can stand sponsor for organic unity only within its own borders. It may well assert that the cell-Church, or gathered communion of cell-Churches, is still a fractional part of the Church of God. But a denomination cannot "order" for the universal people of God. The historic episcopate, if accepted by only another fraction of the people of God, as at present, cannot so order either. But, *if accepted,* it could symbolize unity and continuity. It did once, before the age of hierarchical autocracy and its consequent schisms and doctrinal strife. Humbled in its pride, submitting itself once again to apostolic doctrine, and to the corporate Holy Spirit, serving in place of ruling, the historic episcopate may again be the organ which will witness to the world that there exists in time and in space a people of God — one holy catholic and apostolic Church.

A DRAMATIC APPROACH TO CHRISTIANITY

By GORDON E. MICHALSON

I

WHEN a man effectively challenges Hegel, causes to rise a school of philosophy as potent as the Existential school of Jaspers and Heidegger, fascinates at once Lutherans, Thomists, neo-orthodox Princeton seminarians, and the *Commonweal* and *Christian Century* families, he demands a respectable hearing. When a professional philosopher, an Episcopal clergyman and a Catholic layman vie for honors in presenting him to the English reading public, they say, in effect, that men of religion and without religion everywhere ought to know about Søren Kierkegaard.

Here is a strange sight! Theodor Haecker, the German Catholic translator of S.K., lectures on him in Zürich in 1924. Twelve years later Eduard Geismar, the Danish Lutheran, visits orthodox Princeton Seminary to bring the Dane's gospel to America. Professor David F. Swenson, head of the University of Minnesota department of philosophy, sponsors Geismar's tour of the land and embarks on the pioneer work of translation. The Augsburg Press assists him. Dr. Walter Lowrie, a retired Episcopal clergyman who has spent a quarter of a century on the Continent, continues the task by way of the Princeton University Press. And Alexander Dru, a young Catholic layman in England, issues his translations through the Oxford Press.

Emil Brunner's latest work is a direct issue from Kierkegaard. (23:7, 40, *passim*.) Time and again Reinhold Niebuhr's Gifford Lectures reflect his debt to S.K. Jaspers and Heidegger were certainly prompted by the *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*. Berdyaev is governed by Kierkegaardian principles of personality. Lutherans and Neo-Orthodox are investigating the Great Dane. Unamuno learned Danish to read Ibsen and found Kierkegaard. Without a doubt, this Danish thinker who opposed the Subject-Object antithesis of European philosophy, and changed the first question of the Church from "What is Christianity?" to "How does one become a Christian?" deserves a larger audience than that of a graduate seminar.

How to read Kierkegaard "according to" Mackintosh or Haecker; Lowrie or Swenson; Allen or Schrempf — that is a problem! He will be pathologically obsessed, if you believe Mackintosh. He will be Catholic, if you read Haecker. You will call him a saint if you follow Swenson. And you will daily place fresh flowers before his bronze on your reading table, if you follow Lowrie. Should your responses be as Allen's, you will turn in your orders, forsake your ministry and admit you are a pagan. While those who react with Christoph Schrempf will conclude that faith in Christ is impossible!

David F. Swenson was a young graduate student in philosophy at the University of Minnesota. A book of Kierkegaard's fell quite by accident into his hands. "The name of the author told me nothing, for I had never heard of Søren Kierkegaard." He read the book over the week end. Never before had the young student met such a master of dialectic, such superior ease in handling philosophical concepts, such resources of wit, irony, humor, pathos. "I did not wholly understand it at the first reading, nor indeed at the second or third . . ." (13:2) From then on, every available book of Kierkegaard's was read by the young man. Many years later, after having published the first English translation of a complete work of S.K. — the *Philosophical Fragments,* in 1936 — Dr. Swenson wrote, "I have found in his pages an increasing inspiration for the common tasks of life, as well as clearness and light upon a multitude of intellectual problems of the highest dignity, a matchless delineation of ideals in their ideality, as well as a wonderful compass in the expression of humanly significant moods and feelings of every kind." (13:2)

It was Swenson who constantly inspired Walter Lowrie, and who collaborated with him in the great task of making the great Dane speak English. For thirty-five years he was absorbed heart and soul in the works of S.K. — incomparably the most competent man for the task. The rest of the story of the translation of Kierkegaard — a task not yet complete, is a bibliographical note quite out of place here, as also is the status of the Danish editions, and the German and French translations.

II

Toward Understanding His Thought in His Life. A neat and orderly account of the life of Søren Kierkegaard may be had for the reading of Geismar's first lecture, Haecker's introduction, or Lowrie's *magnum opus.* Born in Copenhagen in May, 1813, — "in that mad year

when many another mad bank note began to circulate," as he once said — this Danish Socrates was destined by heritage and habits to become subject and instrument of a tragic melody.

> I could perhaps reproduce the tragedy of my childhood, the terrifying, mysterious explanation of religion which a frightful foreboding played into my hands, which my imagination worked upon, and the scandal which religion became to me — all in a novel called "the mysterious family." It would begin on a completely idyllic, patriarchal note so that no one suspected anything until suddenly the word sounded which translated everything into terror. (11:457)

His father at twelve had cursed God for the loneliness of his sheep-herding existence; at forty, had missed his wife and muddled his morals by an injudicious interlude with his housekeeper. His second marriage followed, and five months later a son was born. This double fault preyed on the mind of Kierkegaard the elder. He gave up his business and devoted the remainder of his life to a rigid study and practice of religion. The shock of learning this secret was a brutal blow to Søren.

"How terrible about the man who once as a little boy, while herding the flocks on the heaths of Jutland, suffering greatly, in hunger and in want, stood upon a hill and cursed God — and the man was unable to forget it even when he was eighty-two years old." (11:556) How terrible that such a commonplace of child life should have indelibly impressed the genius mind of S.K.! Or is it providence? Perhaps the very germ of genius is hidden here — as Wordsworth wrote, "One being is elevated above another in proportion as he possesses the capacity to be excited to significant feeling without the application of gross and violent stimulants." (13:3)

Again the Journals vividly reveal what is prosaic in mere restatement. "A relationship between father and son, where the son secretely discovers everything behind, and yet dares not acknowledge it. The father is a respectable man, severe and God-fearing, only once in a state of intoxication he lets drop a few words which hint at the worst." (11:503)

But despite this tragic childhood, the more tragic by the imposition of an adult religious discipline upon the child, so severe that Søren wrote of it as "a species of madness," and insisted that he "never enjoyed the happiness of being a child," there is yet this loving reference to the father: "I learnt from him the meaning of fatherly love and so was given some idea of divine fatherly love, the one unshakeable thing in life, the true Archimedean point." (11:335)

Kierkegaard the elder studied Christian Wolff; the younger studied Latin. At seventeen, he finished grammar school — slow in maturing, as his principal wrote, having an inordinate desire for freedom, possessing excellent natural gifts, but sadly lacking in seriousness of purpose, "very gay and frank." Enabled by the wealth of his woolen-merchant father to attend the University of Copenhagen as a gentleman's son, he studied philosophy and theology. He was a student of Sibern and Møller — and also of Heiberg, the Hegelian exponent in Denmark. In order the better to understand him Søren translated much of Hegel into Danish. Both his style and terminology betray the influence of Hegel. The *Postscript* employs the great idealist's own weapons in what Professor Swenson has called "the most thoroughgoing and absolutely destructive criticism that the Hegelian philosophy has, to my knowledge, ever received." (13:11)

Much has been made of the mental oddities of Kierkegaard — oddly enough, both by friends and those who wish thereby to dodge his insights. But it is not enough to say his was a "split personality" — even if we read in his Journal of 1837, "I am a *Janus bifrons,* with one face I laugh, and with the other I weep." Douglas Clyde Macintosh would evade the mighty powers of this master by calling him irrational, and literally meaning it; Hugh Ross Mackintosh, whose sympathies are insufficiently accompanied by appreciation, will pare his stature by a comparison to Newman's habit of overstatement with Kingsley: "Had I said these things in ordinary tones, no one would have taken the least notice. I was obliged to speak at the top of my voice." (22:255) Geismar and Professor Svere Norborg of Minnesota, will agree with a Danish psychiatrist who labels Kierkegaard a manic-depressive. Søren was most aware of his melancholia. Moreover, he was sensitive to the social cure for it, as when, as his niece reminds us in her memoirs, he urged sending Henriette to a girls' school, "because it seemed to him that I was too disposed to melancholy to stand the more lonely life which lessons at home would have involved." One savant remarks, "One needs be a bachelor to be a scholar" — and adds with slyness, "and that's too high a price to pay." But Kierkegaard paid the price. And he was helped rather than hindered by this strange emotional cast which hid much of the world from his eyes while he pondered the problems of existence and the personal.

The recollections of one Hans Brøchner tell of Kierkegaard at twenty-three even as his rare pictures reveal him — odd bushy hair

brushed up as if it were a comb, a high collar which gave him the appearance of a clerk behind a counter, "something very irregular in his whole appearance." The word "misshapen" finds its way into the description. And the suggestion that walking with him along the street was like running an obstacle course — as he wandered from one side of the walk to the other, gesticulating with his cane. (11:563) Israel Levin, his private secretary, mentions unending fuss, strong soup, strong coffee, the ritual of peering into the cup to watch the sugar melt, a collection of fifty different cups and saucers, and a multitude of canes. "His life cost him amazing sums," he was "amazingly punctual," and he made one-day trips into the country of North Zeeland. He was a victim of his moods, and constantly dwelt within the palace of his vigorous imagination. He lived as a miser for a time, to catch the spirit; he wanted to commit a theft so that he would know the meaning of a thief's guilt and fear of apprehension. "Anyone who wishes to deal with S.K.'s life must take care not to burn his fingers — it is so full of contradictions — he talks a great deal about double reflection — his conversation was more than seven-fold reflections." (11:561ff.) So akin to Coleridge in many ways, he yet paid his bills on the first of every month! His spontaneous capacity to conjure up imaginative stories was such, wrote his secretary, "that I felt most uncomfortable."

But Henriette Lund speaks of Uncle Soren with marked affection. His very oddities endeared him to the children of the family circle. "How is it possible," she wrote, "to remark ironically that 'his physical advantages were not many' when one had talked with him intimately, if only once, seen his face so full of 'esprit,' and the 'finesse' of his whole appearance?"

Then there is pathetic mention of a slight, well-shaped, aristocratic nose, a mass of hair, a mouth though large which witnessed to the whole scale of moods "from gentle sadness and tenderness to bold defiance or subtle irony. . . . And then his eyes, they did not fade with age but their naturally soulful expression received so strengthened a brilliance that they shone like stars the last time I saw him in the hospital. . . ." (11:app. I, 556) Again, there is the picture of the children happily visiting their Uncle Søren, whose jokes and games, whose tours of the zoo and whose rare and delightful meals made him, with his faithful servant Anders, a most indefatigable and intriguing host. The jaunts along the street were to the children times of great joy. "In fact the streets of Copenhagen were a large reception room for him,

where he went about early and late, and talked to everyone he wanted to." His interest in classical music, and in Shakespearean drama is scattered throughout the memoirs of his niece.

Michael Pedersen Kierkegaard, Søren's father, died in 1838. Søren was twenty-five years of age. Henriette Lund wrote, "he took it as a bagatelle." But Søren's outward appearance was deceiving. Two days later he wrote in his Journal: "He died . . . for me in order that if possible I might still turn into something." (11:215)

Years before, he had passed his matriculation examinations in the University of Copenhagen *cum laude,* and had received the equivalent of a *magna cum laude* for his Greek, history, French, and Danish composition. His second examination found him with a *cum laude* in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and history; and a *magna cum laude* in philosophy, physics and mathematics. With liberal studies out of the way, he had for some time been prepared to study theology. Instead, in the years prior to his father's death, he had studied little theology but very much history, literature, and philosophy. Meanwhile, Søren's brother Peter had taken his theological examination, and had returned from Germany with a new Ph.D., to teach at Copenhagen. Søren's decision now to complete his theological study, and the consequent writing of his master's thesis — the equivalent of our doctorate — was in harmony with the family hope. His dissertation, "On the Concept of Irony with particular reference to Socrates," was published in 1841, less than two years after his father's death.

The years from 1831 to 1838 meant crisis to Kierkegaard. A misunderstanding with his father sent him out to live life as he found it, rolling up a pile of debts which his father one day was to assume as he welcomed the prodigal back home. Søren, brilliant, pleasure loving, overstuffed on the religion of his paternal home, was not mere spectator of Christianity; he was an open critic. He recognized Christianity as an "imposing figure," quite proscribed by Papists, Biblicists and creedal enthusiasts. And he dodged Christ as a moth might well dodge a flame. "With a feeling of dim apprehension I have sought to avoid coming into too close contact with the phenomena whose attractive force might perhaps exercise too great a power over me." (12:122)

His occasions of bacchanalian revelry appear to have involved a brothel, and the possibility that "another being owed its life to him." (12:132) But though bills piled up at the coffee house, the gaming table, and the tobacconist, the highest bill was for books. And as the

mind was not neglected, neither were the days of Christian discipline forgotten. In April, 1838, we read in the Journals: "If Christ is to come and take up His abode in me, it must happen according to the title of today's Gospel in the Almanac: Christ came in through locked doors." (11:196) But on May 19th — "at half-past ten in the morning," there is entered the following passage:

> There is an indescribable joy which enkindles us as inexplicably as the apostle's outburst comes gratuitously: "Rejoice I say unto you, and again I say . . . rejoice." — Not a joy over this or that but the soul's mighty song "with tongue and mouth, from the bottom of the heart . . ." (11:207)

Some will complain that the language of an evangelical testimony is missing. Truly it sounds more like Pascal than like Wesley. But the whole Journal and the whole life of Kierkegaard sustain us in our confidence of the authenticity of this experience. And a few days later, his critical understanding reveals itself sharply: "According to Christianity man is not to be merged into God by way of a sort of pantheistic disappearance, or by the obliteration of all his individual traits in the divine ocean, but by a heightened consciousness." (11:220) Christ had baptized his queer spirit with his saving grace; but the man remained, Søren Kierkegaard, introvert. "Man shall 'give an account of every idle word he has spoken,' and although grace washes away sin, the union with God proceeds through personality, transfigured by that whole process." (*Ibid.*)

It was such a man — scholar, melancholic critic of life, converted aesthete, fortunate son of a rich merchant, tragic heir of a tragic father — who added the incomprehensible story of Regina to the far more lucid romances of Beatrice and Laura and Heloise. He met her first when she was fourteen. When she was seventeen, they were engaged; when seventeen, parted — she, the heart-broken victim of the undefinable affections of the "great Dane"; he, the equally crushed victim of his own eccentricity.

The whole work of Kierkegaard is doubly difficult to fathom. He is often speaking to Regina by way of his literature which, at the same time, has another office. She fought to keep him, pleading in the name of Christ, and in the memory of his dead father. Why he returned her ring, why he at last was forced to represent himself as a scoundrel in order deliberately to turn her against himself — this is but another of the unfathomables attaching to the man. The fact is, the very day follow-

ing their betrothal, he wrote, "I saw that I had made a false step. . . . I had to say that I could be happier in my unhappiness without her than with her . . ." (11:367)

Regina is brokenhearted. And Søren pines. He writes about her in his Journals, and he inscribes books to her. He tries to apologize in person, and via his various writings. All Copenhagen thinks him a scoundrel — except Regina and his brother. As late as 1849 he writes, "My will is unaltered that after my death the writings should be dedicated to her and to my deceased father. She shall belong to history. . . . My existence shall unconditionally accentuate her life."

Two other emotionally combustible areas shaped the temper of Kierkegaard's life. These were a brilliant and devastating literary duel with the Danish equivalent of the *Spectator,* a magazine called the *Corsair,* and the year 1848 wherein he began to feel the press of financial distress, experienced a second conversion experience, and suffered the hardships of Denmark's war with Germany. In a certain respect, Kierkegaard precipitated all of these troubles: he goaded the editor of the *Corsair* into defamatory criticism and became the laughing stock of the town. He made an ill-starred investment just about the time the draft took his servant Anders, and lost so heavily that his financial distress and his domestic embarrassment left him in a sore mood. Furthermore, as Professor Hirsch has said, "the year 1848 represents the climax of Kierkegaard's intellectual productiveness." (12:392) Which is but another way of saying in S.K.'s own words, "God had run me to a standstill."

III

Toward Understanding His Mission in His Thought. It was, by the way, in this same year, 1848, that Kierkegaard wrote *The Point of View* which, with *Sickness unto Death* and *Training in Christianity,* was said by Professor Hirsch to "have more prospect than any other Christian theological productions of the nineteenth century of finding a place among the imperishable writings of the Christian Church." (12:392) In *The Point of View,* the author assumes a direct style to inform his reading public what his complex authorship is all about. It is a type of *apologia,* a "report to history" as S.K. himself calls it. Attracted to Xenophon's *Apology* as a possible title, he rejected it, remembering that Socrates had made no defense. It is in this work that we see Kierkegaard primarily as a religious and not an aesthetical writer. There has

been a progressive tendency in the literature. The aesthetic group ha included *Either/Or, Fear and Trembling, Repetition, The Concep of Dread, Prefaces, Philosophical Fragments,* and *Stages on Life's Wa* with eighteen successive edifying discourses. The religious group ha consisted of *Edifying Discourses in Divers Spirits, The Works of Lov Christian Discourses, The Crisis,* and *A Crisis in the Life of an Actres* Then, serving as a bridge between these two groups stands the *Co cluding Unscientific Postscript*. As S.K. himself wrote:

> The Postscript constitutes the turning point in my whole work as an author. I presents the "problem," that of becoming a Christian. Having assumed respons bility for the whole pseudonymous aesthetic work as a description of *one* way person may take to become a Christian (viz., away from the aesthetic so as to b come a Christian) it undertakes to describe the other (viz., away from specula tion, etc., so as to become a Christian). (1:xiv)

The term "concluding" referred to his oft-repeated intention to giv up his writing for the pastorate — an intention which he was still rei erating years later.

In *The Point of View,* Kierkegaard explains the seeming duplicity o his literary schema. He has always had a religious purpose. With on hand he has held out an aesthetic work, published pseudonymously, en deavoring by indirection, in Socratic fashion, to lead men to the truth With the other hand, he has held out his edifying discourses, his direc effort published over his own name. "When I began *Either/Or* . . . was potentially as deeply under the influence of religion as I have eve been . . ." (6:18) "I am and was a religious author . . . (whose) whol work is related to the problem of becoming a Christian, with a direct o indirect polemic against the monstrous illusion we call Christendom." His purpose throughout was to reintroduce Christianity into Christen dom!

Life and philosophy for Søren Kierkegaard are one. Not only the in volvement of his style, which is at once due to several factors — but th uniqueness of his thought is a reflection of the great Dane's revol against the sacred canons of European philosophy. Of course, Kierke gaard is at once a poet and a philosopher. Then as he writes, he is a once a philosopher, a psychologist, a classicist, and an evangelist. Th channeled minds of modern students are not prepared to read a wor which knows no academic boundaries. Again, at times the difficulty is a matter of Scandinavian vernacular cumbersomely translated, or a

sheer lack of Ciceronian restraint. But usually the trouble a modern student finds with Kierkegaard's modes of thought is that the Dane is thinking practically. He is reading his thought from the pages of his own life.

No neat system confronts us — even though a clever dialectic fascinates us. All of the tools of Hegel are employed; but no Hegelian product is forthcoming. In fact, Kierkegaard, like Socrates, is primarily interested in a way of thinking, rather than in the result. Furthermore, like Socrates, all of the keenest energies of his mind are directed at ethical problems. The category of the existential, much heard of in modern times in the work of Jaspers, Heidegger, Scheler, Przywara, and the school of German phenomenologists, belongs first of all to Kierkegaard. The extremes of some of these men, however, must not be blamed upon the Dane. A man is not totally responsible for his *epigoni*. The fact is, both Jaspers and Heidegger appear to be en route to a system in which the existential is caught in the grasp of orderliness.

Kierkegaard has nothing but scorn for the professional philosopher who builds a mental palace, but fails to live in it, lying instead down in a dog-house at its side. In his language, "to exist" means more than simply "to be." "Ex-istere," to stand out from — the etymology of the word helps us. The concreteness of the human ego, as it stands out from its environment — indeed, as Przywara has it, as it stands in polar relation to the Divine — this is existence. (1:xviii) A message from the *Postscript* contrasts the two modes of reflection — objective and existential:

> When we inquire about the truth objectively, our reflection is objectively directed to the *truth as an object* to which the knower stands related. . . . When we inquire subjectively into the truth, reflection is focussed subjectively upon the subject's *relationship*. (1:178)

If this be the case, then as Lowrie says, "The Christian has to renounce the comfort of calm assurance bolstered upon objective proofs, and must be content with a fighting certainty. He constantly lies over a depth of seventy fathoms." (1:xviii) This is a bitter pill to some Christians. But the alternative — the responsibility of proving the authenticity of the Scriptures, the accuracy of the Church's history, and, indeed, whether 2,000 years of Christian history is any greater demonstration of the truth than a single day — the alternative is not too inviting! If the philosopher is a believer as well, he will realize that it is his

faith, not his speculation on which his infinite interest in his eternal happiness dwells.

Lessing is Kierkegaard's inspiration in this matter of the inwardness of truth. The *Philosophical Fragments* had asked the question, "Is it possible to base an eternal happiness on historical knowledge?" The *Postscript* was Kierkegaard's promised and unscientific sequel in which he handled the same problem in a historical setting. The way of stating the problem, "How am *I* to become a Christian?" makes theology alter its response which has hitherto been formulated to answer the objective question, "What is Christianity?"

With the Pope in Browning's "Ring and the Book," S.K. declares dramatically, in *Either/Or,* that life is just the terrible choice. The choice lies between a life lived in terms of happiness or of duty — the aesthetical or the ethical. The work is a serious attempt "to wound from behind," to "begin with paganism" because that is where the world is living. The very title of the book is a rebuke to that amoral all-inclusiveness so typical of objective thought. "I who am called Either/Or," he writes, "can not be at anyone's service with Both — And." His New Testament is before him. ". . . It . . . exercises an enormous influence over me and inspires me with an indescribable horror of Both — And." (12:554)

The work is in two volumes — the first, the tale of a voluptuary; the second, letters from a staid and moral Judge, William by name, who out of the fruitful respectability of married loyalty, attests to the young libertine the values of moral living. Similar in plan to Plato's *Gorgias,* there is, however, no Socrates to support the ethical in the face of the aesthetic. The young libertine is without question the cleverer dialectician. On a verbal scale, he would win the argument. While Judge William argues that the road to genuine life lies through despair, he reflects the biography of Kierkegaard. He loses the argument; but wins the battle! This is but a vivid way of saying that communication is indirect — that the success of the ethical depends on its inherent appeal, not on the eloquence of the appeal.

The emphatic concentration upon the individual, which the factor of freedom and choice allowed in *Either/Or,* is continued definitely in the *Fear and Trembling.* The relation of the individual to the universal is discussed against the backdrop of the story of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac — a story which ". . . involves a teleological suspension of ethics. As the Individual (Abraham) has become superior to the uni-

versal. This is the paradox which can not be mediated." (3:95) Berdyaev echoes S.K. at this point in *Solitude and Society* when he calls the Ego "the foundation of all philosophy," and calls the mission of philosophy the probing of "the meaning of *life* and *personal* destiny." (19:27) And Berdyaev lays low the rationalists' bias of the whole history of European philosophy, when he finds a subjective basis for the intellectualism of Descartes, Spinoza and Hegel.

Niebuhr also echoes S.K. when in his *Nature and Destiny of Man* (Vol. 1) he discovers that the *self* has been lost in naturalism and in idealism alike, and when he adds in true Kierkegaardian tone:

> Idealistic philosophy always has the advantage over naturalism in that it appreciates the depth of the human spirit. But it usually sacrifices this advantage by identifying the universal perspective of the self-transcendent ego with the universal spirit. (20:75)

Indeed, the concept of the individual which S.K. propounds, and "personality" as Berdyaev would term it, is no more to be identified with rationality than with the causality of the mechanists, or the enthusiasm of the romanticists. Max Scheler is quoted by Niebuhr in pressing this very point — that the final dimension of "spirit" is in contrast to mere reason. What is usually meant by "reason" fails to include "spirit"; but "spirit" does imply "reason." (*Die Stellung des Menschen im Kosmos,* 20:162) Personality in this larger sense is the very essence of the *existential.*

But it is by way of "dread," the tragic self-awareness of sin, which is a "sickness unto death," that the personality makes its pilgrimage through the successive "stages of life" until having experienced a "repetition," it enjoys a relation with God in Christ. The Socratic "know thyself" is inadequate in the Kierkegaardian pattern. "Choose thyself" is a proper substitute. Yet, Greek wisdom is greater than the later Greek rationalism. The Greeks before Aristotle would never have understood the division between life and thought which characterizes the history of European thought. Greek wisdom had to do with a way of life! Still, the Socratic view of evil was inadequate for Kierkegaard. Socrates was the midwife of *intuitive knowledge* which has but to be recollected; Kierkegaard, in his maieutic way, was the midwife of *eternal status* to be regained by repetition. In one case, reflection was the road; in the other, faith.

This amazing function of divine grace, Kierkegaard explains as fol-

lows: "When in defining repetition one characterizes it as 'transcendent,' as 'a religious movement by virtue of the absurd,' 'when one has arrived at the borders of the marvelous,' when I say that 'eternity is the true repetition,' then I think I have expressed myself pretty intelligibly for the real reader of the book . . ." (4:xxii) Or if the indirect method of communication is preferred, listen to this story: "The tempests have raged themselves out — the thunderstorm is past — Job has been reproved before the eyes of men — the Lord and Job understand one another, they are reconciled, the intimacy of the Lord *dwells again* in the tents of Job *as in former days* . . ." This is what is called a repetition. (4:132)

But how does this read in terms of evangelical Christianity? Perfectly analogous! The direct communication of the edifying discourses which paralleled the pseudonymous aesthetic works would confirm this.

> They talk about works of love. . . . But when they say "*the* work of love," . . . about Him, Jesus Christ, about His atoning death, about Him who hides the multitude of sins. This is preached at the altar; for what is preached from the pulpit is essentially His life, but at the altar, His death. He died once for the sins of the whole world, and for *thy* sins;
>
> His death is not repeated, but *this* is repeated; that He died also for *thee,* for *thee* who dost receive the pledge that He died also for thee, this is repeated at the altar where He gives Himself to thee for a shelter. Oh, sure hiding-place for sinners! (9:23)

And the great Dane was unashamed to personalize the matter even more, when in 1838 in registering in his Journal the Hegelian reflection that "Christ died for all," not for a single individual, he added in joy, "Also for me!"

IV

However much Søren Kierkegaard might have been willing to let the secular search for truth run its normal course, he certainly would have agreed with Emil Brunner that "the Biblical understanding of truth can not be grasped through the Object-Subject antithesis: on the contrary it is falsified through it." (23:21) His dramatic approach to truth, especially to *the* Truth is properly stated by Brunner: ". . . Narrative and not doctrine is the adequate form to express the essential message of the Bible." (23:115) For "this greatest Christian thinker of modern times" (23:82) to know the Truth which makes man free, was not to know a series of truths as one would know a philosophical

judgment, but to commit oneself to fellowship with Christ in personal relationship.

But how, granted that this is Kierkegaard, can one know the Truth in Christ without knowing some truths about him? On this question hangs a tale!

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES

Soren Kifrkegaard

1. *Concluding Unscientific Postscript,* tr. D. F. Swenson & W. Lowrie, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1941, 579 pp.
2. *Philosophical Fragments,* tr. D. F. Swenson, Princeton University Press, N.Y., American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1936, 103 pp.
3. *Fear and Trembling,* tr. R. Payne, Oxford University Press, London, 1939, 129 pp.
4. *Repetition,* tr. W. Lowrie, Princeton University Press, 1941, 212 pp.
5. *Sickness unto Death,* tr. W. Lowrie, with Int., Princeton University Press, 1941.
6. *The Point of View,* tr. W. Lowrie, Oxford University Press, London, N.Y., 1939, 174 pp.
7. *Stages on Life's Road,* tr. W. Lowrie, Princeton University Press, 1940, 472 pp.
8. *Training in Christianity,* tr. W. Lowrie, Oxford University Press, London, 1941.
9. *For Self-Examination and Judge for Yourselves,* tr. W. Lowrie, Oxford University Press, London, 1941.
10. *Thoughts on Crucial Situations in Human Life,* tr. D. F. Swenson, ed. by L. M. Swenson, Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, 1941.
11. *The Journals of Soren Kierkegaard,* tr. by Alexander Dru, Oxford University Press, London, 1938.

Secondary Sources

12. *Kierkegaard,* Walter Lowrie, Oxford University Press, London, 1938.
13. *Something about Kierkegaard,* David F. Swenson, Augsburg Publishing House, Minn., 1941.
14. *Religious Thought of Soren Kierkegaard,* Eduard Geismar, Augsburg Publishing House, 1937.
15. *Soren Kierkegaard,* Theodor Haecker, tr. Alexander Dru, Oxford University Press, London, 1937, 67 pp.
16. *Kierkegaard: His Life and Thought,* E. L. Allen, Stanley Nott, Ltd., London, 1935, 210 pp.
17. *Soren Kierkegaard: His Life and Religious Teaching,* Student Christian Movement Press, London, 1935, 160 pp.

Tertiary Sources

18. *On Being Creative,* Irving Babbitt, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1932.
19. *Solitude and Society,* Nicholas Berdyaev, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1938.
20. *The Nature and Destiny of Man,* Reinhold Niebuhr, Vol. I, Human Nature, the Gifford Lectures, Chas. Scribner's Sons, N.Y., 1941.
21. *The Problem of Religious Knowledge,* D. C. Macintosh, Harper & Bros., N.Y. 1940.
22. *Types of Modern Theology,* H. R. Mackintosh, Nisbet & Co., Ltd., London, 1937.
23. *The Divine-Human Encounter,* Emil Brunner, tr. Loos, Westminster, 1943.

THE CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE AND THE CRISIS OF COLOR

By BUELL GORDON GALLAGHER

I

THE compulsions of world events compel us to choose. Eve though white Americans might wish to disregard the mora character of the race problem, and were unready to unleas the resources of religion upon it, the presence of color in the worl scene overrides all objections and forces a decision.

The Indian summer of unchallenged white supremacy is over. Fron now on, an ethical course of action must be discovered, or the whit man is committed to a grim, unrelenting effort to maintain his positio of dominance in the face of mounting opposition. And to maintai that position, the Caucasian will be forced openly and frankly to aban don his nominal allegiance to the Christian religion. The uneasiness o conscience with which he now maintains his differential world status i rapidly approaching an unbearable tension, a tension which can be re solved only by bringing profession and practice more nearly into har mony. We may have Christianity if we want it, but we cannot have both Christianity and color caste: one of them must go. And the deci sion will not wait. It must be made *now,* and acted upon. There is nc longer a tenable middle ground. We have come to the historical mo ment of a final showdown between white supremacy and Christianity The march of events forces us to choose.

This surprises no one. Both secular and religious voices have beer foretelling the coming of this day for generations. In recent decades, we have heard much of the "rising tide of color" from men like Madison Grant, Lathrop Stoddard, C. C. Josey, Charles A. Lindbergh, "the man" Bilbo, and preeminently, from Adolph Hitler and Joseph Goeb bels. The religious press has heard from Paul Hutchinson, Pearl Buck, and a host of others. H. G. Q. Wales, in his *Years of Blindness,* argued that there was no tenable middle ground between a policy of ruthless exploitation and a policy of egalitarianism. Concessions can no longer save imperialism.

The Lord of History is long suffering, but he has regard for Nineveh as well as for Jerusalem. If the Jonahs of today are angry over the with-

ering of their gourd vine of world power, which sprang up over night and has given three short centuries of shade, they are to be reminded that God has an interest in other people on the earth also. The fact that he sits in judgment upon the processes of history is an inescapable fact, written large in the rise and fall of men and of nations through the centuries.

The most conclusive statement of the ethical crisis of color comes in a series of volumes for which the Carnegie Corporation is responsible.[1] Concerned exclusively with Negro-white relationships in the United States, these volumes present with the clarity of a steel engraving the contours and contortions of the conflict between conscience and caste. "The American Negro problem is a problem in the heart of the American. It is there that the interracial tension has its focus. It is there that the decisive struggle goes on. . . . At the bottom of our problem is the moral dilemma of the American."[2]

Volumes like those of MacIver,[3] and Brown and Roucek,[4] admirably supplement the Myrdal series, sketching the parallels in scores of situations involving other races than the Negro, and filling in the background of the picture.

The crux of color caste lies in the fact that it is a concern of conscience. We shall not grasp its essential meaning unless we recognize that this conflict is as unbearable as it is inescapable. This dual fact — that we cannot escape the problem of color caste and that we cannot longer entertain the explosive conflict of conscience — gives an insistent tone to the discontent which springs up within us.

There may have been times in American history when men were not forced by the relentless pressures of the times to consider the voice of conscience in matters of race. If so, these times are past. The trend of events, both in the world scene and within our own borders, has given a fillip to the hopes of the darker races all over the world and made untenable our own immoral dogma of white dominance. We cannot struggle wholeheartedly against the dogma of a Master Race abroad, while continuing to bow before the god of white supremacy at home.

I believe that the historians of the future will record that in our generation the tension became unbearable, and that for the second time within a century, Americans moved toward an irrepressible conflict. Ethical indecision in the matter of race is a luxury no longer permitted to us. The conflict moves with acceleration and crescendo to the coming crisis.

II

Whatever forms of overt pressure or violence we may experience (or manage to avert) we shall not be able to avoid the demands of conscience. The possibility of a global war on race lines is much more real than the repetition of an American Civil War, as we shall see in the next section of this article. All I am now saying, but what I am insisting upon, is that we cannot escape making a choice between the demands of two mutually contradictory modes of action. If we refuse to decide, that refusal will itself be our decision. The voice of conscience will not be silenced. There must be an answer.

We could answer by denying conscience the right to be heard or obeyed. That means the frank abandonment of our basic democratic faith and Christian ethos. It is a revolutionary possibility which would lead us away from the course which for a century and a half the nation has been blunderingly but hopefully following. It would be the counter revolution within our nation, leading to the establishment of dogmas of racism so pernicious and radical in their effect as to make the semblance of democracy a mockery, and so inimical to Christian values as to cut the life line of the church.

Or we can answer by listening to the voice of conscience, and discarding color caste. I mean discard it. Completely. This, too, is a revolutionary proposal. It would lead us out of the halfway house of compromise, in which we have for generations made an uneasy bed, and set our feet once more on the high road of destiny. It would be a revolution in our national life so profound as to alter the patterns of living for every man, woman, and child and for the unborn generations. It would make possible the obedience to conscience which religion demands.

Either of these alternatives, both profoundly revolutionary, would resolve the unbearable tension under which we now labor. But only as we agree that we cannot escape the ethical choice, can we fully appreciate the meaning of the current crisis of color. This is what I mean by saying that the race question is a moral problem.

This does not mean that we can meet the problem by moralizing. If resolutions could solve the race question, it would have been resolved long ago. We do not question the necessity of prophetic preaching and high resolving. We need not less, but more moralizing, in this sense. But moralizing is only the beginning of our necessary strategy. With the awakening of the Christian conscience, we must find intelligent, socially constructive, fruitful, long-range plans of action which are cal-

culated to uproot the iniquities and inequities of racial caste. Only thus can we find an answer to our moral dilemmas.

The ethical character of the problem is seen in the conflict between the demands of our accepted Christian morality and the demands of our accepted racial patterns. One or the other must go. The double task before us is (a) that of sharpening the ethical judgment so that the full meanings of our Christian commitment become clear to every one of us, in specific terms of racial attitudes, patterns, and practices; and (b) that of fashioning the workable social tools and devising the tedious steps to be taken in bringing the day-to-day practices of our social institutions as well as our individual lives more nearly into conformity with the objectives which our ethical conscience sets before us. This dual job of education and evangelization on the one hand, and of social engineering and pioneering on the other, is much more than sermons and preachments. It is high-minded, sincere, complete personal commitment plus wise social action.

That there must be social action should be clear without argument. No matter how earnestly the individual here and there may wish to live by the Christian ethic in the present American scene, he cannot freely do so. He is prevented and inhibited at every turn by the patterns of segregation, the laws and customs and social pressures of his society, and the resultant inner fears and tensions which frustrate his efforts and weaken his purposes. Social action is the enabling act of Christian living. The one valid hope in the present situation is the fact that millions of Americans have not yet frankly and openly abandoned the Christian faith, even though they refuse to practice it. But that hope will be lost if practice is delayed longer. We shall then begin to ease the tension between faith and life by discarding faith. The spread of this moral cynicism lays the foundations for an horrendous structure, a discarding of Christian values, a reversion to pagan gods, and the coming of fascism. In the end, then, the continuance of caste not merely challenges us to find a moral answer to a moral problem; it radically challenges the very existence of Christian morality itself.

III

The Caucasian is a minority group in the world's population, acting and thinking as though it were the majority. Outnumbered three to one in the world, the white man is curiously oblivious to the fact that when he talks glibly about the problems of minorities, he is actually

speaking about himself and his own situation. Yet, both in size and in power, the Caucasian rates as the Number One minority problem in the world scene. He numbers about seven hundred and forty millions as compared with a world total of two billion eight hundred and forty millions.[5]

But the Caucasian minority has a majority psychology. Either in ignorance of his minority status in the world, or in spite of it, the Caucasian feels that he owns the earth and all the lesser peoples in it. His commercial, political, and military dominance of the world enables him to look down upon the subjugated darker peoples in much the same way that the feudal lord was accustomed to survey his vassals from the castle tower. He forgets that, when the hour of history struck, feudalism fell.

It was not until the turning of the twentieth century that a non-white people challenged this dominance in language which the whole world understood. And amongst the pigmented peoples of the world, the fact that Japan successfully met "white" Russia in the theatre of modern warfare is, even to this day, a burning beacon. The contrasting attitude of the darker peoples toward the Japanese invasion of Manchuria and the Italian invasion of Ethiopia has disquieting significance for the white man. There was no great stir amongst colored Americans, for example, when Japan established the puppet state of Manchukuo; but the Negro press followed the Ethiopian campaign of fascism with a blast of excoriating denunciation. In the early years of the present war, before the United States had become an active participant (and it had become less prudent to speak openly), it was not unusual to hear expressions of approval amongst Negro Americans over the way in which Japan was twisting the tail of the British lion in the Far East, showing the white man that he could not dominate the earth. Any Caucasian who thinks there is no resentment amongst the darker peoples directed toward white imperialism and white domination lives in a fool's paradise.

This resentment of the colored peoples is seen not only in minorities within the United States, but in all quarters of the globe. One of India's moderate and reputable leaders, Krishnalal Shridharani, cautiously and mildly states the essence of a bold thesis when he contrasts the attitude of native Indians toward the British Raj in the last century and in this: "In the beginning it was the realization that the British had come to stay which prompted the minorities to jump on the British band-

wagon. Now it is the realization that *the nationalists will not allow the British to stay much longer* which changes their attitude."[6]

Similar expressions, most of them couched in much more vigorous terms, could be cited from writers and thinkers in every non-white portion of the globe — which is most of it. It must be accepted as an axiom of present world conditions that the colored peoples of the world aspire to a position of freedom from white control and white domination which expresses and implies an accepted position of the equality of all races in the world scene. They will endure white domination as long as it is physically impossible to throw it off, and not for one moment longer.

The racial jitters of the whites in South Africa; the rigid governmental controls in Portuguese East and West Africa; the unequivocal stand taken by the late Felix Eboué (an African), governor of the principal French slice of the African continent; the unrest and intrigue in Egypt and the Near East; the seething cauldron of the Caribbean which appears in American news stories in the proportions of a pleasantly simmering teakettle; the coming to age of the native populations of the Island Indies; even the great question mark of the attitudes of the China of tomorrow — all these are an authentic part of the white man's dilemma of world dominance.

The white man's refusal to admit the resentment of the pigmented peoples is a necessary part of his psychological defense mechanism. It is the Caucasian's belief that, being less than men — or being an inferior order of men — the non-white peoples are incapable of resenting white domination. This is the whole cloth out of which is manufactured the myth of the contented and carefree colored man. The refusal to recognize the growing and serious indignation of the darker races all over the world, as well as within America, is a necessary reaction on the part of the Caucasian if he wishes to maintain his dominant position and have an easy conscience. He accepts the fact of his world status as verification of alleged superior abilities; and argues from that to the doctrine of the Master Race, — concluding that, since this is in accordance with the natural order of things, no one can resent it. Since no one can resent it, no one does. But the darker races do resent white domination; and in that ground swell of resentment the ethical judgment of a Righteous God speaks.

He would be a bold man, indeed, who attempted to predict with any specificity the racial outcomes of the present war. The picture is too

confused and confusing to permit nice predictions. Too many things are distorted, and too little uncensored information is available. But we may attempt a rough balance sheet of both the disquieting and the encouraging aspects of color in the world scene.

IV

On the disquieting side of the ledger must go a series of items which need no elaboration because they are common knowledge.[7] The persistence and spread of racial segregation and discrimination in the armed forces of the United States stand as the most inflammatory grievance of American minorities. Paradoxically, the Negro, who has shared least in the benefits of democracy, has to fight for the chance to fight for democracy. Widespread unfairness in employment practices of employers and the presence of Jim Crow in many of the labor unions feed the flames of bitterness. The struggle for housing, particularly in the centers of war industries, has caused several serious riots and continues as one of the hottest points of racial tension. Congestion of travel, and the feeling that differential privileges are given to white travellers, particularly on local and interurban facilities, sets the stage for incidents in which "anything can happen." It does.

The same situation prevails, in modified forms, when other racial minorities in America are brought into focus. The emotional reverberations clustering around several of these other minorities are potent dynamite for tomorrow's explosions. The incarceration of seventy thousand American citizens of Japanese ancestry, together with forty thousand Japanese citizens resident on the Pacific Slope, has only one parallel in American history, — the permanent geographical segregation of American Indians on "reservations."

Many excuses for the evacuation have been given. Not one of the alleged reasons rests on proven fact; and wherever facts have been produced, they have flatly disproved the alleged military necessity for the evacuation.[8] The free circulation of rumors about alleged sabotage by Japanese in the Hawaiian Islands — rumors which have been categorically denied by responsible governmental and military officials in the Islands, who assert that not one act of sabotage of any sort can be laid either to the Nisei or to the Issei in Hawaii at the time of Pearl Harbor or since that time — has served to form a false façade for the unlovely ambitions of non-Japanese residents of the West Coast. More serious than this injustice is the sowing of the dragons' teeth of racial discord

from San Diego to Puget Sound. Experts in racial disharmony, who make their living by fomenting distrust and strife, are available for hire, and make it their business to range over the Coastal States, and at least as far east as Salt Lake City, in the interests of their gospel of white supremacy on the Pacific Slope. They bring out Hitler's doctrine of "protective custody," dust it off, and use it to defend the actions of the military in interning the Nisei. For their own protection, we are told, persons of Japanese ancestry had to be uprooted from the homes where they had lived in peace and harmony with their neighbors, lest suddenly angry Americans should do them violence. The actual activities of vigilante groups since evacuation are calculated to give credence to the otherwise empty threat. Whatever the underlying motives of this campaign of race baiting, the explosive character of Caucasian feelings regarding the Japanese cannot be underestimated. Its implications for the possible "solution" of the problem of seventy thousand American citizens in concentration camps, and its meanings for world policy, are enormous.

Closely similar to the anti-Japanese hysteria of the West Coast is a strong anti-Mexican feeling in the West and Southwest, which reached its temporary peak in the infamous "Zoot Suit Riots" of Los Angeles in the summer of 1943.

With the exception of the Filipinos, the Chinese are the only racial minority within our nation which is honestly made to feel that the present war is intimately connected with its future welfare. They have suddenly been "discovered," in a mild and paternalistic fashion, as desirable citizens, somewhat contradicting the established policies of sharp discrimination which have prevailed since the 1850's first brought Chinese labor in large numbers to American shores. Up to the moment of this writing, however, we have heard of no instances in which restrictive covenants have been abrogated or waived so that Americans of Chinese ancestry might become neighbors as well as being neighborly. The century-old record of discrimination toward Chinese is not wiped out by a sudden kindliness of manner which may prove to be as short lived as the necessities of military alliance with China require.

In the larger world scene, the negative side of the picture is also to be found. The demise of the Atlantic Charter, effectively buried with appropriate funeral ceremonies in the four agreements arrived at before the Teheran Conference, has been followed by the negation of a possible

Pacific Charter in the statement of war aims in the Pacific issued from the White House on February 1, 1944. Commenting on this statement, the *Christian Century* said editorially:

> If this means anything, it means that the United States troops in the Pacific war are committed to helping the British regain their empire in Malaya and the Dutch theirs in Indonesia . . . Millions of Americans have feared that one reason why our armies are fighting in the Far East is to restore European imperialism there. Now they know. (Vol. LXI, No. 8, Feb. 23, 1944. p. 228.)

The silence at the Cairo Conference regarding the future of the Japanese mandated island bases in the Pacific had prepared us for this affirmation of the aims of white imperialism in the Pacific. The critical importance of America's attitude in the Pacific cannot be overestimated. If the peace of the Pacific is to be established on the basis of white dominance, we lay the basis for an East-West war of the future, which would be primarily a color war.

Turning to Africa, the same problem meets us. In that whole vast continent, there are but two islands of racial sanity. Except for Liberia and Ethiopia, the continent is owned and operated by and for the peoples of Europe. This war is not calculated to change that situation. Lying like a great question mark at the feet of Europe, Africa remains the home of the world's most embittered and entangled race relations.[9]

In the Western Hemisphere as well, the practice of the theory of white supremacy by the United States is not calculated to win friends and influence people. We call the nations south of the Rio Grande "Latin" America. They are not "white" in any sense in which the United States uses the term. Except for Costa Rica in Central America, and Argentina in South America, the whole of the Southern continent and the Isthmus, together with the clustering islands of the Caribbean, are populated primarily by persons whom the United States would classify legally as non-whites. The few spots of recent European immigration in some sections of Brazil and central Chile serve only to accentuate the general picture of a "Latin" America which is emphatically not complimented by the lily-white attitudes of the United States.

The effort for hemispheric solidarity, which was once the keystone of the American policy, is still an important stone in whatever arch of peace and security we are to erect. Our racial practices are a direct affront to the people of the other Americas, and will not cement hemispheric solidarity into the peace of tomorrow.

Wherever on the globe we turn the spotlight of ethical scrutiny, the

question mark of color stands out. North America, Asia, Africa, Central and South America — everywhere except Europe. And there, the costliest conflict of history is closely connected with the notion of a Master Race which sought to rule the world. Will the issue have to be joined along color lines on a world scale before we awake to the suicidal implications of the policy of white supremacy? Given an interval in which China and India become industrialized, Africa awakes, and the arrogance of white supremacy drives the pigmented peoples of the world together in common resentment toward the colorless — then let the issue be joined in that most horrifying of all conflicts, a global race war. The little peninsula of Asia which is called Europe, plus Australia and this continent north of the Rio Grande (with possibly the southern tip of South America) will then be pitted against the rest of the world. Slightly over half a billion people pitted against a billion and a half, according to present population ratios — and proportionate rates of increase indicate that when that issue is joined, the ratio would be much more unfavorable to the white man. Such a war to express racial antagonisms could end only in the extermination or subjugation of the less populous minority which had fewer men to feed into the hungry maw of Mars. Quite apart from the probable outcome of such a conflict, the question which the white man must face, and face now, before it is too late, is: how great a price is he prepared to pay for the luxury of racial pride?

V

On the encouraging side of the ledger of color in the world scene, we can enumerate several factors which are somewhat less tangible than the disquieting factors, but which ought to be listed for what they are worth.

Most important is the fact that World War II is not, in the minds of Americans at least, a "Holy Crusade." The present absence of excessive idealisms in connection with war aims and the interpretation of the war to the fighting peoples, argues well for the possibility of a sane and realistic approach to the problems of the peace settlement. In such an atmosphere, ethical considerations have an opportunity for a less prejudiced hearing. At the coming peace tables, hopeless idealisms are not to meet unhopeful cynicisms, to sire another Treaty of Versailles. The absence of the Holy Crusade propaganda and state of mind makes ethical realism possible, if not probable, when peace breaks out.

Further, we are promised a cooling-off period between the cessation of hostilities and the establishment of the post-war world structure. Discussion, in the relatively less inflamed and hysterical period following the armistice, is to be used to work through the problems of a just and lasting peace before the crystallization of the post-war world begins. That period is the great moment of opportunity for the Christian conscience. The prospects of World War III on race lines should be sufficiently uninviting to force even the most recalcitrant to pause and consider. The arts of peace will again be dominant; the spirit of revenge will have run its course; reason may be heard; conscience may find its voice.

The clear and present danger expressed in the sober facts which have just been rehearsed — the suicidal character of the dogma of white supremacy — is the strongest pragmatic argument supporting the voice of conscience. It will be impossible — and I mean impossible — for the United States of America to maintain a position of world influence and prestige as a white man's nation in a world which is predominantly colored, on any other basis than brute force. And that basis will crumble before the counter-force of superior numbers and power when the colored peoples of the world unite against us. Unless we are ready to forego the caste system at home, we cannot expect to be on peaceful terms of mutual respect with that two-thirds to three-fourths of the world which resents the color bar. Nor can we expect to be successful in our efforts of world supremacy for the white man as long as we countenance the presence of more than thirteen million non-whites within our own borders. Either we try to be a white man's country, both by controlling much more rigorously than we have the racial minorities at home and the racial majority abroad, or else we abandon caste both at home and abroad. There is no other choice.

The fact that, both within the church and outside of it, this clear choice is realized, should also be listed as among the hopeful signs. While examples could not be multiplied indefinitely, examples are available to indicate that an important new note of realism on behalf of ethical concerns is appearing in secular areas. My files bulge with several score of such citations from the secular world gleaned during the past few months. In some cases, the ideas voiced and the actions taken are quite in advance of anything yet demonstrated by the churches. In all cases, the forces of an ethical religion will find strong allies as these movements in the secular world grow in size and number. And the

awakening within the church, as indicated by Malvern and Delaware, and to a lesser extent, Princeton, shows that the leaders of the church are aware, as never before, of the meaning of color in the world scene. These declarations show that the leaders of the church know that the hour of decision has struck.

Time is of the essence. Courageous action to match the gospel must be speedily devised and carried through. The rallying of forces through the Federal Council's Commission on Minorities, and the devising of programs by several of the denominations, are favorable signs. It is a matter of great moment that the churches appear to be getting ready to speak the decisive word for the equality of all men, at the historic hour when that word must be spoken if the opportunity is not to pass by forever.

Added to the list of encouraging factors is the fact that we have new knowledge never before available. From anthropology, sociology, history, psychology, economics, education — from all the social sciences, a wealth of materials has been pouring into the stream of common knowledge during the last half century. The Myrdal summary brings matters together into sharp focus. If there were any way of getting every clergyman and every Congressman in the United States to read the Carnegie volumes, there might be some possibility of uniting ardor and accuracy in ethical insight and political action, and thereby of averting the colossal error of attempting to perpetuate white supremacy. Certain it is that the pseudo-scientific banalities formerly bandied about no longer gain credence. Irate Congressmen may ban a pamphlet from the armed forces, as they did with Benedict and Weltfish's "Races of Mankind," but the truths of science will not be halted by the Congressional banning of books any more than by their burning by Hitler. The man who holds to his prejudice can no longer claim respectable scientific justification for his beliefs and practices.

We also have new tools which the social sciences are gradually elaborating and perfecting. Many of them are in their initial stages; others have been tried, revised, tested, and found useful. For the first time in history, the church has available tools of social reconstruction which make it possible for us to go courageously and surely beyond the level of mere moralizing, and on the level of social engineering to implement our ideals with realistic action. Moralizing will be transformed into moral action when and if we make bold to use the knowledge and the instruments which the social sciences have provided.

In the end, the fairest hope of resolving a moral problem is in the strength of the moral resources available. Color is a conflict in conscience, a conflict within the conscience of the white man. It will cease to be a conflict only when color has become irrelevant. The high resources of a great religious faith are the moral and religious imperatives for the achievement of that end. Men who live by faith — *live* by it, not merely giving lip service — know that God is the Father of all mankind. They know that individuals and social institutions stand under the judgment of the Lord of History whose judgments demand brotherhood among men. They know that they violate these judgments at their own certain peril. Men who *know* these things, can no longer tolerate the strictures of color caste. They will unite. They will speak. They will be heard. They will act. They will destroy the iniquitous caste system. In the name of God they will destroy it.

REFERENCES

1. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and American Democracy,* by Gunnar Myrdal, New York, 1944 (2 vols.), summarizes in masterful fashion a wealth of materials never before made available by the social sciences in so complete and comprehensive a fashion. *The Myth of the Negro Past* by Melville J. Herskovits (1941); *Patterns of Negro Segregation* by Charles S. Johnson (1943); *The Negro's Share* by Richard Sterner (1943); and *Characteristics of the American Negro,* edited by Otto Klineberg (1944), complete the published materials of the Carnegie Corporation study. Some fifty thousand pages of manuscript materials in addition are lodged in the Schomberg Collection of the Harlem Branch of the New York Public Library.
2. Myrdal, *op. cit.,* p. 1.
3. *Group Relations and Group Antagonisms,* edited by R. M. MacIver, New York, 1944.
4. *Our Racial and National Minorities: Their History, Contributions, and Present Problems,* edited by Francis J. Brown and Joseph S. Roucek, New York, 1939.
5. *Survey Graphic,* Vol. XXXL, No. 11, Nov. 1942, p. 505.
6. "Minorities and the Autonomy of India" by Krishnalal Shridharani, in *Group Relations and Group Antagonisms,* edited by R. M. MacIver, New York, 1944. (Italics added)
7. For an excellent factual summary of growing tensions within the United States see Charles S. Johnson's *To Stem This Tide,* Boston, 1943.
8. Cf. Galen Fisher's *Balance Sheet on Japanese Evacuation,* a reprint of a series of articles in the *Christian Century,* August and September 1943, obtainable from the Committee on American Principles and Fair Play, 2234 Telegraph Avenue, Berkeley, Cal.
9. Cf. *Africa and the Atlantic Charter,* a report prepared by the Phelps-Stokes Fund, New York, 1942, in the days when it was still thought that the Atlantic Charter was to be of some use in directing world policy. The Fund pointed out that Africa should not be forgotten.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF CHURCH CO-OPERATION

By ROSS W. SANDERSON

I

THE Basic Point of View. "Recognizing that in God's universe variety and unity are in harmonious relation, we, the member bodies of this Federation, declare that likewise among us there is inherent in our variety and freedom of faith and order an unbreakable *unity* which has its basis in a common loyalty to Jesus Christ and *which we must express in co-operative activity* in matters of life and work." So reads the preamble of a recent revision of the constitution of a local council of churches. On some such premise all church co-operation proceeds. Recognized unity has its own imperative.

In another city, at a recent worship service commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of their local council, representatives of the churches affirmed, in the spirit of Edinburgh but in their own words:

> Loyal to the truth as God gives to each of us to understand it, and members of many branches of the Church, nevertheless we do solemnly avow our essential unity in Christ . . . We are one in purpose to unite in fellowship with all true followers of our Lord that His service may be strengthened and His Kingdom increased . . . We are one in our purpose of so demonstrating our unity in Christ that the world may know that God did send Him and may find peace and unity in Him.

Similarly, one of the recently announced aims of the comity committee of another local council is "to recognize an essential unity of faith and purpose among us while acknowledging a diversity of experience and polity." Likewise a new council writes into its constitution its belief "in the inherent unity of purpose of the several denominations."

The "general purpose" of all councils of churches "is to give practical expression to that inherent and unbreakable unity" which their members "have declared to exist among them." Such language is all the more significant because it is phrased by the lay mind. Christians are rediscovering the territorial unity of the Christian enterprise. This new expression of unity in Christianity has transformed the essential nature of Protestantism. The correlative principle of unity is being

recognized along with the principle of freedom as of equal significance and value. Common membership in the one family of God is being professed with growing enthusiasm. An increasing feeling of oneness makes possible an increasing amount of practical co-operation.

Historically our present-day churches root in widely different cultures and traditions. The New Testament itself gives evidence that within the unity of the one faith there was a wide variety of experience and practice. St. Paul recognized these opulent "diversities of gifts." The varying polities of our time, and the sharply contrasting theories of the church, are all held by their proponents to stem from apostolic days. Co-operative churchmanship deals with a wide range of viewpoints and practices, but recognizes that with all their "variety in form and methods" community righteousness demands from the churches "a united witness" and "a solid impact." Lack of agreement on faith and order no longer delays practical co-operation in life and work. Diversity and unity grow less contradictory.

In the last five centuries we seem to have come full circle. The rise of nationalism shattered the unity of the church. In America lovers of freedom achieved the separation of church and state, an arrangement all the more appropriate because of the heterogeneous old-world origins of most of our churches. Frontier conditions put a premium on individualism. The great migrations of our times have renewed our understanding of our interdependence. Whereas secular forces tended formerly to separate the churches, universal world needs and community obligations now force them to make common cause. Who knows but that the Protestant Reformation could have been avoided, if, a century before Luther, the Council of Constance could have built on any such measure of indigenous democracy in the church as now constitutes a new base for world-wide Christian co-operation? In any case, perhaps for the first time within five hundred years, unity *and* freedom now seem within reach of a considerable portion of the church. It is increasingly realized, moreover, that without some larger measure of unity it will not be possible to maintain our heritage of freedom in the new age now being born. Once again conciliar Christianity faces a great historic opportunity, this time with far larger hope of success, by reason of the gains achieved during four Protestant centuries. In repudiating its errors, it is no longer necessary to ignore the fact that it was the pre-Reformation Church which preserved from New Testament times those enduring assets of which all Christians are

alike heirs. Our freedom in Christ is exceedingly precious, not less so is our unity in him.

II

Definitions. The church, some hold, is primarily the *koinonia,* a *fellowship* rather than an *institution.* However, the visible church very early became the *ecclesia,* an "institution."

"The church," as we commonly know it, has three different organizational meanings. "Church" may refer either (1) to the local congregation or parish, (2) to the communion (or denomination), or (3) to the church universal, now increasingly called ecumenical.

A *Local Church* is an association of Christians united by a common religious heritage, a common geographical location, and a consequent common purpose and task. The characteristic local church is the heir of a spiritual tradition. Even if it be a "federated" or "community" church, its backgrounds have to be sufficiently homogeneous to make possible a congenial fellowship. Rejection of the divisive effects of the sectarian tradition is itself a common heritage.

The common geographical location may be a neighborhood, urban or rural, of small radius; or it may be a considerable area within which private or public transportation makes it possible for persons who constitute an interest group to assemble according to their common interests. Even in the latter case a considerable portion of the local church resides within a comparatively short distance of its meeting place, which is also usually called a "church." Whatever the area primarily represented, the local church presents its own peculiar needs and opportunities.

The local church is the basic unit of all wider Christian fellowship. To it individual members or member families belong. Local churches, however they may be related in larger groupings, constitute the ultimate strength of Protestantism. In the local church Christians are voluntarily associated for purposes of worship, the preservation of the Christian culture, and the extension of the Christian fellowship. Everywhere, however, this fellowship is felt to be more than human, a response to the divine initiative; everywhere in some sense the local church is regarded as a part of the church universal. However organized, all wider fellowships have as their major purpose to help local churches to do their work better, separately or together.

A *Communion* (frequently designated as a denomination) is an

association of churches, geographically more or less scattered, but united by a distinctive religious heritage, expressed in terms of a common doctrine, sacraments, ordinances, polity, or mode of worship, which they seek to preserve and propagate. Communions have smaller and larger units extending upward from the individual member in the local church. Typical *structures* include (1) districts, associations, presbyteries, deaneries, etc. (local areas); (2) conferences, synods, dioceses, conventions, etc. (usually covering states, parts of states, or combinations of states); (3) general councils, conferences, assemblies, conventions, etc. (national); also (4) world fellowships of various sorts. Ecclesiastical geography varies greatly, according to the varying density of denominational population. Communions frequently disregard county lines, and do not always follow state or national boundaries.

Relationships within the communions also vary greatly, especially as to the authority exercised at the various levels. Those practicing a congregational *polity,* even though they may employ bishops, put major emphasis on the autonomy of the local churches, which associate themselves heartily in a free fellowship. As the state has been forced to add representative government to absolute democracy as practiced in the town meeting, so the complexity of modern life has tended to modify congregational church polity. Presbyterianism emphasizes the presbytery rather than the synod; presbyteries initiate action in general assemblies and must concur in such action. Episcopal polity stresses the diocese or conference as the determinative unit. Strong Methodist churches grow increasingly congregational; the administrative authority of Episcopal bishops is constitutionally restricted. (Dioceses in the Roman Church are far more autonomous, and Roman bishops have far more independence of action than many Protestants realize.)

All national Protestant bodies are limited in the exercise of their *authority* by the known attitudes of their lesser territorial units, and by prevailing opinion among local churches; but the actions of some bodies are regarded as more authoritative than others. "Discipline" is a word not uncongenial to the Methodist mind; "canon" is a term respected by Episcopalians. "Courts" seem normal to Presbyterians; but Baptists and Disciples refer to usage rather than to legislation, which is to them an unnatural and offensive term for church action. The degree of lay participation in church control varies, but some provision for it is everywhere made; and exercise of lay control seems often to be

quite as much a matter of administration as of structure. Not many communions would elect a woman as president of their national convention, but the Baptists have done so. At the present moment it is widely assumed that for international purposes the most representative expression of denominational life is on the national level.

Local churches and the communions to which they belong are definite administrative entities. While the unity of the Church everywhere assumed in the New Testament is spiritual rather than organizational, the ideal of "one Lord, one faith, one baptism" has never been lost, and is nowhere denied. Witness the widespread use of the Apostles' Creed, with its "I believe in the holy Catholic Church," whatever modification of language or typography has become traditional in the differing communions. *The Church Universal,* however, is as yet an inclusive concept rather than a single organizational reality. It is an inclusive, timeless fellowship, rather than an organic expression of this fellowship within time. Few churchmen, when they think of the Church Triumphant, are as serious about their differences as they are when administering the Church Militant. Some hold that the church as a totality should be termed "the Body of Christ," others that this term should be reserved for the company of true disciples, known only to God, who constitute the Invisible Church. As a communion of saints "the Church is the people of God in all ages who have been called by him into his fellowship." Opinion differs as to whether "a congregation of believers in Christ in a local community" should be said to include "all those willing to receive his benefits" or only "those who have manifested real devotion to him." In speaking of the church popular usage attaches both mystical and administrative meanings to the same terms.

Church membership is unfortunately no adequate guaranty of true spiritual achievement. Whatever their residence, whatever their communion, many individuals fall short of the Kingdom standard. Accordingly, it is sometimes argued, the church is quite as properly to be regarded as a communion of sinners as of saints, more properly if "saints" is understood according to its modern meaning. Furthermore an occasional outstanding or humble personality, not formally connected with the visible church, may seem to deserve to be enrolled among those who really advance the cause of Christian brotherhood.

The growing ecumenical spirit endeavors to bring the different communions into fuller fellowship and greater unity. It exists to the

degree that individuals, local churches, communions and other bodies are willing to join in this partnership. There is no one world-wide organization which embodies it, but there is a growing co-operation among world organizations which partially expresses its spirit. It consists of communions, plus interdenominational agencies and structures, together with a fringe of non-ecclesiastical bodies gratefully recognized as of very great value to the Church Universal though not ecclesiastically constituted.

III

Councils of Churches. In community experience there are increasing demands upon "the church" as a whole. The guardians of public order ask, "What does the church think?" They do not have time to interview all the churches. Public schools, struggling with the problem of religious education, cannot deal administratively with all the separate Protestant units of a great city, or even a small village; still less a commonwealth or nation. The federal government, wanting chaplains for its armed forces, finds it difficult enough to deal with three great faiths, not to say scores of communions. On every level there are being developed co-operative expressions of the life of the Church Universal that are receiving increased recognition as "the church." Thus secular forces tend to modify theological and ecclesiastical concepts.

This situation involves dangers to which church leaders are very much alive. While the commitments of the communions to the principle of ecumenicity are much deeper now than they were even a decade ago, they have many reservations when it comes to specific expressions of the ecumenical principle. They have not yet found an entirely satisfactory formula for contributing their sovereignties as a part of a more inclusive loyalty. They consider themselves competent agencies in matters of faith and order, i.e., in the administration of the sacraments, ordination, polity, church extension (at least in normal times and places) at home and abroad, and in formulating the faith.

However, with varying degrees of willingness or enthusiasm, local churches and the communions to which they belong are now granting limited corporate expression to their common purposes. A characteristic evidence of increased interest in the oneness of the Christian enterprise is the growing demand for the organization of councils of churches.

A *Council of Churches,* under whatever name (Federation, Inter-

church Fellowship, United Churches, etc.), is a partnership of churches or of denominational units, or both, located within the same general geographical area, and committed to common purposes and responsibilities. Where two or more churches recognize a joint responsibility, or two or more communions face a common task, a council of churches enables these churches and communions, each of which has its own historic unity, to express their common loyalty to Jesus Christ in terms of the needs of the geographical area within which they are at work. Local churches are increasingly recognized as "more than denominational outposts." The corporate functions of the church in the community require for their discharge a co-operative agency.

Councils exist (1) to express or embody whatever unity exists and is recognized by the churches and the community, and to train individuals and organizations for the fuller expression of this unity; and (2) to make possible the co-ordination of local church and denominational effort, for the maximum use of all their resources. Councils make possible common action in zones of agreement; and maintenance of fellowship, common study, and experiment in zones of difference. Councils are (1) *inclusive,* i.e., concerned with all the recognized co-operative functions of the churches, or (2) *limited* to a single function, such as religious education, home missions, or foreign missions.

Councils differ also in the range of their geographical responsibility — local (city or county), state (or regional), national, international; in the basis of their representation — congregational, denominational, interdenominational; and in the sources of their financial support. For the most part, membership in local councils is held by local churches, in state councils by the appropriate territorial units of the co-operating communions, in national and international councils by the communions themselves or their appropriate boards. In the territorially more inclusive councils the representation of councils as such is relatively meager. County and city councils are represented in state councils; state councils have membership in the International Council of Religious Education. The Federal Council and the proposed National Council provide for representation from state and local councils, but membership is restricted to persons named by member denominations. While a logically consistent scheme of relationships between denominational and interdenominational structures at the various levels, and between interdenominational structures serving less and more inclusive geographical areas, has not yet been adopted, local councils are

now seen to be as genuinely interdenominational as those larger bodies representative of entire denominations.

Local churches are the foundation stones of local and state council programs, as well as of those denominational programs which are nationally co-operative. The old Sunday School program was strong because it rooted first in thousands of Sunday Schools. Co-operative churchmanship and the association of individual Christians are essentially different. This is not to claim that one structure is superior to the other. Historically the Christian Associations have been able to accomplish what councils of churches could not do, and vice versa. Emphasis on the *inter*denominational is not necessarily failure to appreciate the pioneering and permanent values of the *un*denominational. The World Council of Churches gratefully recognizes its debt to the Student Christian Movement, in which so many of its leaders were trained.

The comparative effectiveness of councils, on different levels (local, state, national, international), and among different councils on the same level, obviously depends on a wide variety of factors which largely condition success, or even ability to survive. When a state council is "desirous of making virile Christianity function creatively as an agency of the religious life" of a great commonwealth, and purposes to "foster co-operative action in promoting application of the law of Christ to all human relations," its member bodies ought at least to help it secure adequate resources of money and personnel. The demand for councils, even under conditions which have previously prevented their existence, seems now to be greatly increased. The world crisis has underscored the impotence of isolationism in religion as in statecraft, and has emphasized the value of the "practical, working unity . . . NOW in operation" in councils of churches.

Even where common action is not possible, because of obstacles which cause misunderstanding and limit fellowship in any given area of activity, councils are free to unite their constituents in a common study of such obstacles, in the hope of removing preventable misunderstanding and enlarging the range in which fellowship is possible across difference. When these obstacles grow out of a theory of church government which makes co-operation difficult or impossible, because of the fear of what it may involve in the direction of organic unity, councils have been able to work out many forms of co-operation which do not involve this likelihood. Denominational leaders who insist that

co-operation and co-ordination must not deny the self-determination and local autonomy of constituent communities, and who stipulate that the "complete autonomy and corporate integrity of each communion shall be mutually respected and safeguarded," can at the same time be "impelled by the manifest need of augmented power in the churches." Thus the ecclesiastical situation parallels the international.

What the communion is to the local church by way of vertical, historical relationships, the council is by way of horizontal, community relationships. Diversities of faith and order separate churches into communions; identities of purpose and responsibility with reference to their communities unite churches in interdenominational councils. Councils of churches are made up of churches or communions sufficiently different to want to maintain separate denominational loyalties but enough alike to want to co-operate. Each local church is thus privileged to maintain a dual relationship — denominational and interdenominational; and the larger units of each communion may similarly relate themselves both to the more inclusive denominational units and to the more inclusive conciliar units.

Whenever churches help their members to express a true partnership with Christ they give meaning to the ecumenical church, whether the relationships involved are denominational or interdenominational. The growing sense of world unity reenforces the sense of community in the world, and is in turn reenforced by the churches' growing sense of their own world-wide unity. Councils of churches grow in their significance as instruments by which the churches and communions can further the one purpose to which all are dedicated. *Ultimately the task of an inclusive, adequately representative council in any given territorial unit is the task of the ecumenical church within that area.* State and local councils are the channels through which the communions of Christendom may both experience and practice their professions of ecumenicity at the level of local church life and of the territorial units of the denominational church life. Councils, like local churches, must constantly strive to avoid parochialism. If the communions tend to be sectarian, councils in smaller areas are in constant danger of being provincial. Comity, for example, from the ecumenical standpoint involves not only courtesy and efficiency locally, but also the more equitable distribution of Christian resources, including personnel, throughout the entire planet. In spite of all their weaknesses and limitations, however, state and local councils exhibit *the most con-*

crete, dynamic and positive ecumenicity yet developed. Here ecumenicity achieves rugged reality.

Councils of churches are not the Church; they are created by the churches. The Church is more than the churches, though it is the churches which constitute it. As many churchmen would agree, "The Church is not a voluntary society of believers associating themselves for religious purposes. The Church, as shown to us in the New Testament, is constituted not by the beliefs or the will of men, but by God himself for the accomplishment of his eternal purpose for mankind." The council movement, however, has come to the time when it seems increasingly clear that God is using it for his own purposes. To that extent it would seem to be a significant phase of the Church's evolving life. The larger portion of the New Testament consists of letters written to the Church that is in Corinth, Thessalonica, Galatia, or some other given area. The council movement, though not an adequate expression of the Church that is in any modern city, state or nation, is a portent of the more unified Church-that-is-to-be. On the global level the World Council of Churches, still in process of formation, has been able to command the loyalty of communions long hesitant to co-operate as a matter of expediency in local situations, but quite unwilling to face much longer the conscience-searching question, "Is Christ divided?"

IV

Council Objectives and Functions. Councils of churches have such *objectives* as these:

(1) to give expression to the inherent unity which their member churches or communions have in their common loyalty to Jesus Christ;

(2) to develop a growing fellowship, through the promotion of Christian activity, which will take the Christian message to the individual and corporate life of the people, and promote its application in all their relationships;

(3) to provide such co-operative and co-ordinated leadership as the member bodies agree is needed, for the maximum use of all denominational resources without wasteful competition;

(4) to assume such corporate spiritual ministries as are declared by the member bodies to be their common responsibilities;

(5) to interpret the moral and social problems of the community

or larger area served) to the member bodies, and to mobilize their resources for solving such problems.

To attain such objectives involves varying degrees of co-operation, according to the willingness of the co-operating bodies at any given time and place. On the simplest level, local churches may undertake various forms of *collective self-service,* like community schools of leadership education, or vacation schools. Here only a minimum of more or less temporary organization is needed, especially at first. Where such ventures succeed, they are likely to eventuate in more formal and more permanent structures, which may in turn be built into more inclusive administrative wholes.

On a second level, precisely the same functions, or others, like a united church canvass, can be conducted separately by churches or communions, but *co-ordinated* by some simple interdenominational structure created by its member bodies for the performance of one or more tasks. Here the chief emphasis may be on simultaneous action, but a core of corporate procedure is likely to develop, as, for example, joint publicity. Activities like visitation evangelism may be conducted with as much separateness or as much unity as the co-operators desire.

The next stage is *corporate* thinking, speaking and acting. For example, a council of churches may employ a chaplain for one or more institutions or neighborhoods, or sponsor the work of an individual whose services are contributed by a member body or even at public expense. At this point comity will have ceased to be merely the avoidance of overlooking and overlapping, and may have evolved into interdenominational social engineering, expressing itself in corporate ministry of one sort or another; or it may involve "a Master Plan for the cultivation and growth of the spiritual aspect of the city" (or other area served).

Through all these stages *creativity* has been increasingly manifested. A "plus" has been added to the separate activities of member bodies; co-operating churches tend to rediscover the Church. In their co-operative activity they find correctives for the inadequacies of their previously unmodified denominationalism and parochialism. So *directly,* by doing things together and talking things over as co-operators, and *indirectly,* by jointly training workers to do things separately but in a spirit of co-operation, an interdenominational fellowship is slowly built. In time this rich, new fellowship finds itself a creative agent in its

own right. Churches which co-operate come much closer together; they acquire a new and more inclusive loyalty, which enriches and fulfils their separate loyalties. Within this larger framework their separate tasks are better performed, and together they do what none of them acting alone could hope to have accomplished. Even the range and significance of their separate tasks increase as churches confer on how best to perform them. In all their common work they find that the fragments of the ecclesia are discovering anew the joy of the *koinonia*.

In seeking to designate the areas of corporate responsibility as distinguished from local church and denominational responsibility, one is led to ask a prior question: What is *the basic function of religion in community life?* It would seem to include:

(1) The creation and maintenance of moral standards and motives.

(2) Spiritual motivation of community welfare concerns.

(3) Steady witness to God's place in human affairs — "preaching the Gospel" as over against the secularistic and materialistic pressures of the world.

(4) Proclaiming "Good News," in contrast with the bad news of actual contemporary events.

(5) Personal and social salvation, with renewed emphasis on redemption and immortality.

(6) Social reconstruction, with the reconciling of old tensions and the creation of new ones.

All of these are *desirable outcomes of Christian effort*. Out of such generic religious functions areas of corporate responsibility suggest themselves for the joint action of the churches. In practice, it turns out that worship, education, fellowship, missions and extension, pastoral care, benevolence, social service, social reconstruction, evangelism, and any other recognized functions of church life, be they few or many, concern the local church, the communion, and the council of churches, all three.

The ministry of the Church to persons and to families might seem to be rendered best by the local church. However the press and the radio have created an area of *communication* in which even individuals and private homes can also be served, and perhaps best served, by interdenominational councils. Accordingly councils promote the publication and circulation of materials for the guidance of family life, and the education of families for more adequate Christian citizenship.

Where people live in interdenominational communities, interde-

ominational forces play upon them. In a rapidly unifying world-order *nly concerted church action can hope to make much impression.* Vhether in local matters of social welfare, or in the effort to do away ith war, all the churches are vitally interested in the organized con- ern of society for all its members. Government officials, public educa- ors, and social workers frequently declare that the most divisive influ- nce in community life is Protestantism. Councils of churches are able o interpret *the community* to its religious forces, and to mobilize the eligious forces of the community for its betterment. Whatever has to lo with the life of the community as a whole, on any level — local, tate, national, or world-wide, is a council concern. Thus a number of he newer local and state councils propose to study the religious needs of the people, the churches and the community or communities, and levise plans through which these needs can be met. A city council as- erts that through it "the churches have risen to a new plane of leader- hip in community life." Councils are also giving new and dynamic witness to the significance of the community in the life of the church.

Councils are inevitably charged with the responsibility for church contacts with public education and higher education — as in weekday religious education administration, adequate campus ministry, etc. Likewise councils are responsible for *relations* with government, international, domestic, local. When legislative bodies are subject to conflicting demands from opposing pressure groups or organized blocs, councils can largely embody the conscience of the political unit involved. Councils can implement the ministry of religion to individuals in institutions, public and private; and help to see that available social services are utilized, and that others are made available. Similarly councils are able to secure the co-operation of social agencies to do for the members and constituents of the churches what might not otherwise be recognized as available service.

While the courage of lone voices is to be commended, effective, continuous opposition to destructive forces, and an adequate public relations service in behalf of all organized religion for the maintenance of good moral conditions, can probably be accomplished only through councils. Councils know and can serve vocational groups better than less inclusive bodies. The field of research and *survey* is increasingly recognized as an area in which only councils can do the most adequate work. *Comity,* church adjustment, social engineering, all lead to a new ecumenical sense of the corporate life of the Church as a whole in a

given area. Unchurched groups, classes and neighborhoods are a proper concern of all the churches and communions through their councils. Of all the major factors which enter into the determination of our national life, few if any have received so inadequate attention as the community relations and responsibilities of local denominational churches. Events are leading all our communions into a deeper understanding of this situation. War-time needs have commanded their attention and co-operation, much of which is likely to continue in the post-war years in terms of new councils or of increased programs in the case of established ones.

A composite listing of some of the more frequent tasks undertaken by many councils enables any council to compare the range of its activity with those of others. Probably no one council would want to undertake all of these responsibilities. *Whatever is the work of the ecumenical church at a given moment in a given area, it is the privilege of the council of churches in that area to undertake.* The application of the conciliar technique to today's problems provides a method by which we can hear what the Spirit is saying to the churches, and will yield new insights of faith in terms of great affirmations of common convictions underlying separate emphases. Statements like those quoted in this report already confirm this expectation. The slogan, "United in Service for Spiritual Enrichment," makes it evident that the measure of unity which the churches possess is increased by their resolute effort to express the same in corporate activity.

V

Conclusion. The administrative consequences of the ecumenical movement for the churches and the communions are very real. This movement greatly reenforces the experiments in co-operative churchmanship which began long before the word "ecumenicity" reappeared in the vocabulary of the church.

Every church member should learn to affirm: *"I belong to the Church Universal.* My church belongs to the Church Universal." His church should teach him this. When one joins the church, one joins not only that one local organization, for worship, fellowship and service; one joins not only the one communion with which the local church happens to be associated; one ought also to have a high sense, expressed in the very liturgy of the occasion, of joining the Church Universal. If the ecumenical church is to have reality, all true Christians will be en-

uraged to become conscious of their membership in it. "The first ed of many Christians is . . . to be led into a fuller realization of the iritual reality of which they are already a part." Why should not the gular inspirational and devotional aspects of denominational life in- ude the fundamentally spiritual idea of ecumenicity?

We can have an exclusive theory of the church, or we can have an umenical church; we cannot have both. Ecumenical churchmanship necessarily inclusive. This applies alike to all communions, whatever eir creedal emphasis or lack of it, whatever their polity, whatever eir type of churchmanship. Members of local churches can legiti- ately demand that the churches to which they belong shall co-operate ith the other churches in the same community, and councils of urches can fairly expect that one test of church membership will be illingness to work with members of other churches in community sks that will help to make ecumenicity local. In the church "belong- g" is an important matter, whether it be belonging to the local urch, the community, the Church Universal; or, deeper still, to rist who is the hope of every human fellowship.

Local, state, national and world-wide councils are imperfect expres- ons of the ecumenical fellowship; but where the local church is asso- iated directly, or through its communion, or in both ways, with the ouncil movement, its members acquire a new sense of spiritual unity. he divisions of our Protestant world, however appropriate their ori- in, have tended to obscure this unity; they need not continue to do so. n councils of churches the principle of unity is being fused with the rinciple of freedom. Where local churches are not free to co-operate, enominations have become a limitation on the freedom which they riginally sought to assert. Communions that divide communities early negate the ecumenical ideal. Freedom to differ ceases to have eaning at the point where it destroys freedom to agree. What our ommunions have in common is not only far more significant than hat they separately emphasize; one council asserts that they "have astly more in common than of difference."

When *councils* are the denominations officially co-operating in the ommunity, they *deserve* as loyal *financial backing* as is given to de- ominational agencies. The churches from which councils get their uthority are responsible for their support. If fundamentally new re- ponsibilities are being undertaken, or older functions are being more fficiently or economically performed interdenominationally, then de-

nominational funds may appropriately be made available. This can be by appropriations from denominational treasuries, or by denominational accrediting of individual and local church gifts to interdenominational work, or by both methods. What is true of national interdenominational councils in this regard is true also of state and local councils. More adequate ecumenical education will make possible the better financing of all councils.

The integration of denominational into interdenominational procedures permits also the identification of denominational program activities with interdenominational, and the uniting of denominational personnel in an interdenominational staff and constituency. Staff co-operation, however hearty, is only a beginning; real ecumenicity requires the participation of ministerial and lay volunteers, and a sense of partnership among financial supporters. Ministerial and Sunday School Associations are to be commended for pioneering community programs; the logical outcome of such co-operation is a Council of Churches. The same applies to federations of women's missionary societies.

Church co-operation is essential locally, regionally, nationally, and on a world scale. As "patriotism is not enough," so parochialism and denominationalism prove inadequate to meet the demands of these days. Does not the mind of Christ indicate that some form of closer unity is desirable and should be accepted by the churches as the will of God? Co-operating territorial units constitute one of the inevitable forms of closer church unity. As there is variety among the denominations (now largely of an accidental and temporary sort), so there is variety among the territorial councils. Churches that associate themselves around common tasks within a unit of territory find that their association, when it is interdenominational quite as much as when it is denominational, yields an increasing sense of divine leadership. Churches and communions, increasingly recognizing their spiritual unity, find in councils of churches a means of expressing in practical, democratic terms the brotherhood which is their common heritage in Christ. It is just as important to achieve integrity of the religious community, in order that the religious tasks of today can be efficiently undertaken, as it is to preserve denominational integrity, in order that the religious heritage may be preserved in all its richness and propagated effectively. *We move toward a time when the entire church will function ecumenically at all levels,* through the co-operative churchmanship of all the communions.

RUSSIA AND THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

By PAUL B. ANDERSON

THE all embracing character of the conflict in which more than half the people of the world are now engaged adds poignancy to the movement for Christian unity on a universal basis. Effective progress is being made in harmonizing the policies and purposes of all the nations in matters of food, relief and rehabilitation, in providing a monetary basis for world-wide commerce and exchange, and even as regards general political organization. The participation of representatives of the USSR in these undertakings, at first considered an anomaly, was later taken for granted; and now there is growing appreciation of Russian contributions to them.

The thought, therefore, naturally occurs that the participation of Russian Christian Church bodies might add notably to the development of the ecumenical movement and increase its effectiveness throughout the world. Leaders in this movement have ceased to regard it as limited to Protestants. Though dismayed at the Papal Encyclical of 1927 which revealed Rome's definite aloofness from the movement, they have been heartened by the steady growth in contacts and even purposeful discussions with nearly all other bodies calling themselves Christian. At the center are the churches separated from Rome in the sixteenth century, with their manifestations in several great and smaller bodies, chiefly in Europe and North America, but embracing also the younger churches of the Orient and Latin America. On the fringe stand bodies jealous of preserving precious elements in church life which they feel in conscience bound to defend; in some cases these elements are products of the Reformation, in others they are claimed to be essentials of church life which the Reformation tends to violate.

I

In Russia both of these extreme types of churches are to be found. In both the Orthodox and the sectarian bodies there are intransigent elements. Some of the things for which they stand will become better understood and will unquestionably prove of great value to the fellow-

ship of all Christians. However, even when assurance is given that true ecumenism means not seeking a common denominator but that each church may bring in the whole of its Christian heritage, that all will stand before God in humility, eagerly accepting his guidance in striving for greater things, — even then there will be no rapid response on the part of the Russian Church. Its history has been too full of misfortune and misunderstanding coming from the West to permit it to expect an approach without guile. We need think only of the Crusades and their effect in finally dividing the Christian Church into East and West; of the medieval Church Councils ostensibly for unity, which in fact merely demanded surrender of the East to the West; and of the charges of idol-worship which characterized the attitude of Lutherans and Calvinists toward the Russians for many generations. To these historic factors must be added complications due to the interplay of religion and scientific humanism, of church and state, in what seems to be an unpredictable kind of federated national life in the Soviet Union. Historical factors may be reviewed and error corrected, doctrinal differences may be discussed and understanding achieved; but we need ourselves to learn to enter into the dynamic processes of human life of today if we are to gain an insight into and ability to deal with the social and psychological problems which must be met in co-operating with Russian Christians in the ecumenical movement.

Another fact which must be borne in mind is the essential unity of all the Eastern Orthodox Churches. These embrace the four ancient Patriarchates of Constantinople, Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria, the ancient self-governing Churches of Cyprus, Georgia and Sinai, the five great national Churches of Russia, Romania, Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria, and the minority Orthodox Churches in the territories of Eastern Europe, as well as the large Orthodox bodies in the United States and elsewhere which, being made up of immigrants and their descendants, are still dependent on the several Mother Churches on matters of jurisdiction and doctrine. With the exception of the latter group, each is independent in administration. Yet this administration follows a common historic pattern, for they constitute a single Church modified by local or national historical developments and circumstances. No one of these Churches can or will act alone with reference to the ecumenical movement, yet each one may approach it, advise it, and counsel with all the others with a view to eventual determination of common policy. Some have greater weight in determining relations, because of size,

ctual or potential power, capacity to deal with questions of doctrine nd church policy, or circumstantially greater freedom for dealing with ich matters. Four of the national Churches have had greater or less nare in the movement in the past; yet none will finally commit herself ithout participation of the Russian Church in an inclusive gathering f Orthodox Church representatives to discuss this matter. Such a lathering was attempted in 1931, but was postponed *sine die* when the atriarchate of Russia found it impossible, for various reasons, to par- icipate. While, therefore, we cannot deal with the Russian Church part from the others, it is important that we give special attention to nis Church because of her significant place.

II

The few official or semi-official statements which have come from he Russian Church with reference to the ecumenical movement have evealed great cautiousness. This is in spite of the very active participa- ion of Russian theologians and bishops of the Russian Church in exile. These have given significant indications as to the way in which the novement may best advance if it is to have the fuller participation of he Russian Patriarchate. In 1931 the Patriarchate wrote a letter to the rganizers of the Orthodox Pre-Council, referred to above, in which ve find the following:

> In its essence the question of the union of churches demands the greatest legree of discernment. Here only that union will have real value which rests up- n the complete unity of aspiration. We on our side cannot give up our belief hat only our Orthodox Church, found in its completeness in the East, is the Church of Christ. The uniting with our Church of some other body we can con- eive of only by the analogy of the saving of the drowning. It would be strange if he drowning, before accepting help from the ship, should begin to put forward ome sort of conditions. This would be a clear evidence of the fact that he either loes not wish to be saved, or does not realize the hopelessness of his position. (Anderson, *People, Church and State in Modern Russia,* p. 181.)

In the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate, Nos. 23–24, 1935, Metro- olitan Sergei (later Patriarch) dealt further with this matter in a long rticle on the "Meaning of the Apostolic Succession," in which we find uch statements as this:

> The non-Orthodox bodies which have separated from the Church, those which possess (as they say) the apostolic succession, as well as those which do not possess t; those who desire to have priests as well as those who do not recognize the au- thority of priests — all of them are considered by the Church to be a single, uni-

form mass of Christians deprived of grace, who are called Christians only because of an inaccurate definition of the word.

On the other hand, the careful analysis of the American Episcopal Book of Common Prayer made by a commission of the Holy Synod and published in 1907, reveals real discrimination, and is plainly based on the assumption that they were dealing with a body which is somehow a part of Christ's Church. Similarly, the exchanges of greetings between the late Patriarch Sergei and the Archbishop of York, at the time of the latter's visit to Moscow, October, 1943, contained more than courteous remarks. There was unmistakable evidence of historical relationships and of plans for their future development.

There are evident reasons why progress has been slow, of which three may be noted: (1) conditions of the life of the Russian Church both under the Tsars and under the Soviets, during the period of the rise of the ecumenical movement; (2) the historical experience of the Russian Church with sectarian bodies in Russia; and (3) the nature of relations, or lack of relations, with the Roman Catholic Church. These may be dealt with in reverse order, particularly because of the recent exchange of comments between the Patriarchate and the Vatican in regard to the Pope as Vicar of Christ.

III

Shortly before his election to the high office of Patriarch, Metropolitan Sergei preached a sermon (later published in the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate and reproduced in translation in *The Protestant* for May, 1944) in which he said:

> In the light of apostolic teaching concerning the actual unity of Christ the Holy Father with His body — the Church — any arguments about vicariates in the Church in reality become unthinkable. . . . From the Gospels we learn that the Lord Jesus Christ bodily departing from the mundane world did not at all mean to renounce His care of His church. To the contrary, He definitely promised the Apostles He would be with them until the end of ages to assist the observance in the Church of all He preached to the Apostles. This is how our Church understands the words of the Lord; and our Church sees in this constant companionship with her Lord the guarantee of her invincibility before the gates of Hell.

Proceeding to deal with the actual administration of ecclesiastical affairs, he states: "Perhaps it would neither disturb nor counter the described course of church development if sometime a single leader or representative would head the Universal Church in the capacity, for

example, of chairman of the oecumenical council, not as Vicar of Christ, of course, but solely as head of the church hierarchy."

It may be a sign of the times that the Vatican should take swift umbrage at these remarks. In his address to the Cardinals at Whitsuntide, the Pope himself made a rebuttal when he said:

> Those who declare – as was stated or rather repeated not long ago by some representatives of religious confessions that are called Christian – that there is no Vicar of Christ on earth, for Christ himself promised to stay in his Church as its Head and Lord until the end of all times, besides taking away the very basis of episcopal task, despise and betray the profound significance of pontifical primacy which is not a negation but a fulfillment of that promise. The words of Christ to Peter do not leave any doubt of their meaning: in them the East and the West in wonderful harmony believed for a long time. The desire to set up a distinction between Christ as Head of Church and his Vicar, to see in the assertion of one the negation of the other, means to overturn the most glorious and luminous pages of the Gospel, to shut their eyes before the most ancient and venerable witnesses of tradition and to deprive Christianity of that invaluable heredity of right knowledge and the consideration of which will give rise among divided brothers – a moment that is known only to Him and with the light of that grace which He alone can give – to a profound longing for the Father's home and to the effective will to return.

There are numerous points at issue between the Roman and the Eastern Orthodox Churches. At the time of the formal separation, in 1054, the list ran up to about fifty points. The most frequently referred to, however, are the *Filioque,* the married priesthood (in the Orthodox Church), and beginning Lent at Ash Wednesday instead of the previous Monday. As for the Papal supremacy, the customary Orthodox view is that the Pope, as the Patriarch of the West, is of equal rank with the other ancient Patriarchs and, with deference to St. Peter, might properly be "chairman of an oecumenical council," as indicated by Metropolitan Sergei. It is not a question of prelacy, for the bishops of the Russian Church have in history proved quite despotic, but of the principles of government within the hierarchical administration of the constituent parts of the Church Universal. Yet the Russians insist that the root of the question is not jealousy over power, but difference in the understanding of the meaning and operation of God's grace in the Church. Among the Orthodox, and the Russians in particular, it is felt that grace is given to the Church as the body of faithful, with a special charism to bishops and priests for administering the sacraments. The validity of the sacraments is attested not alone by the apostolic succession but also by the recipient of succession being in harmony with the

whole flock of the faithful and the doctrines and traditions of the Church. Those who would understand this point of view should read up on "Sobornost," which is the Russian Orthodox conception of the essential unity in love of all the faithful in the Church. This conception, which brings the prelate much closer to all the members of the Church, defies the logical structure of administration and salvation represented by the Roman Catholic Church, and naturally also the idea of the Pope as Vicar of Christ. It is far removed from the idea of priesthood of all believers, and has nothing to do with congregationalism. Some would see in it an approximation to the Quaker interpretation of sacrament, because of its emphasis on the mystical presence of Christ; yet the Orthodox insistence on hierarchical orders presents a disclaimer here also. Students of ecumenism have here a basic element upon which to exercise their wits and their spiritual faculties as they strive to achieve a common language with the Eastern Church.

It will help them if they note that the difference between East and West is not merely "Eastern mysticism" but a result of difference in the historical development of education. While the West was experiencing the rejuvenation in learning given by the Renaissance, Russia was entering the period of Mongol occupation and consequent suppression of learning. It missed the restoration of the disciplines of Greek dialectic and Latin logic. The very life of the Church depended rather on spiritual experience controlled by ritualistic forms. Even the Reformation scarcely impinged on the mind of the Russian Church. Luther and Calvin were confused, and learned Lutherans visiting Russia were questioned principally on ceremonial order. Yet ritual and form successfully held together not only the structure but the doctrine of the Church, and when, during the nineteenth century, Russian theological science began to pass over from mere defense of form to philosophy and doctrinal development, it represented a church with a high development of spiritual exercise, moral teaching and charitable institutions. Throughout this period the Orthodox Church conducted a struggle of preservation and defense, rather than of attempts to regain Western Christians to the Orthodox fold (except within the confines of the Russian Empire). It lacked the instruments of offense: logic, concise statement of doctrine, and above all the theory of administrative supremacy which would have led it not merely to defend itself against but rather to seek to seize the power held by the Pope.

This defensive attitude is characteristic to this day, as is evidenced in

the quotations we have given. It is to be seen among the Orthodox outside of Russia in the laws passed by the Greek Government, at the instance of the Orthodox Church, in 1939 against proselytizing; and in the successful struggle of the Serbian Patriarchate against the Concordat nearly achieved in Yugoslavia in 1937. It explains why the Russian Church could give no effective answer to the Anglican deacon, William Palmer, who went to Moscow during the middle of the last century with the logical proposal: either accept me as a Christian into the Orthodox Church, or make a real effort to spread Orthodoxy throughout the Anglican communion.

IV

The apparent reasonableness of Palmer's proposal lay in the attitude of the Rusian Church to nonconformists within the Russian Empire. It is customary to think that the Russian Church has ruthlessly suppressed all dissidents. This is in large part true, and it follows directly from the theory of the Universal Church being composed of the several territorial units, in each of which all Christians are of one jurisdiction; and also from their utter adherence to the doctrine that the Church is one. At the same time we must bear in mind that the greatest body of dissidents separated because the Russian Church did strive to modify its forms in order to restore them to ancient and universal (Orthodox) acceptance. In a sense, the dissidents, as they themselves insisted, cast out the Orthodox. Apart from this great schism, which persists today as the "Old Believers," nonconformity expressed itself in exaggerations of elements which were in themselves really quite prominent and certainly accepted in Orthodoxy itself.

One such exaggeration was spiritualistic: every man can be like God. It is mysticism withdrawn from the earth. From the sixteenth century there have been individuals, then their disciples, then large followings, who have followed this line. Here again we see the effect of the lack of the disciplines of learning. The Orthodox, themselves lacking such learning, could combat these aberrations only by demanding conformity, and accepting the police action of the state as a substitute for what we would call educational processes. Yet we must realize also that these sectarian groupings almost invariably became psychologically morbid if not actually anti-social, with their prophesyings, mystic vigils, orgies and castrations. The West has had its share of such tendencies, not only in Europe and Mexico but occasionally even in the

United States. The Orthodox can rightly claim that there is ample room within the Church for true expression of the soul's longing for God, and that when it seeks to express itself outside the discipline of the Church, there is great likelihood of aberrations that are fatal to the soul as well as the body.

A second nonconformist tendency has been the evangelistic: every man a preacher. This also has been in large measure indigenous, although from the beginning of the seventeenth century there have been moments at which strains from the Western Reformation have entered into contact with these movements. In this case also the absence of learning, and of the instruments of dialectic and logic, put the Orthodox Church in a weak position. On the other hand, its very insistence on ritual and form, and its inability to explain otherwise than by experience, led visitors from abroad to consider the Orthodox as idol-worshippers, and to look upon them as a field for missionary endeavor. With this in view, Luther's catechism was translated into Russian and published as early as 1628, in Stockholm. The Dukhobors and the Molokans were indigenous sects; but as early as 1817, contact was made with them by British and American emissaries, and it was an Englishman, Lord Redstock, who, through his influential standing in high society in St. Petersburg, was able to lay the foundation of the first serious attempt to bring about unity among the current spiritualistic and evangelistic sects. This was in 1884. The Russian, Pashkov, who directed this effort, met failure because there was insufficient common ground among the sects, quite as much as because of state opposition. Since that date there has been further influence from Baptists, Mennonites and Methodists from abroad, with moments of apparent unity in Russia, followed by evidence that the disparate elements were persistent in their differences. The Orthodox view is now, of course, tempered by its growth in learning and ability to understand better the causes, as well as the nature, of Russian sectarianism. Even in Peter's time, Lutherans, Calvinists and Roman Catholics had a recognized place in Russia, since they were known to have discipline, order, and a doctrine which stemmed from the Church, even though it did not conform. They were considered as standing quite apart from the exaggerated tendencies which grew out of the darkness of the ignorance of the Russian peasant.

As it faces Russia the ecumenic problem will meet with the continued struggle within Russia itself—not so much the struggle between the Orthodox and dissidents or sectarian bodies, as the struggle within

the soul of the Russian people as it strives to find expression. At the time of the Revolution it was estimated that there were 25,000,000 in the dissident groups along with 100,000,000 who were Orthodox. We do not know of the numbers today, nor have we even as much information regarding these groups as we have about the Orthodox, incomplete as the latter may be. In approaching the Russian Orthodox Church, however, we must realize that her leaders will look twice, and even more, to see if in the ecumenical movement there may not be forces which, perhaps unwittingly, tend to strengthen the aberrations instead of Christianity as a whole in the USSR.

V

It is at this point that we must face the question of the position of religion as such in the Soviet Union, and of the Orthodox as well as the other religious bodies. Will the state authorities look with favor on relations between religious bodies in the Soviet Union and their corresponding bodies abroad, or on relations with the ecumenical movement as a whole, which will strengthen the churches and the religiousness of the people? Up to the beginning of the war, the answer would have had to be on the negative side. And if it is different now, does that mean more than a temporary shift in policy, with the likelihood of return to restrictive measures on religion when war-time pressures are released? Having in mind the dialectic principles upon which the Soviet Government determines strategy in its purposeful attempt to perfect a Marxian socialist society, it is to be expected that the position of religion and of external religious relationships will vary with serious changes in the relationship of forces which dominate Soviet policy. Nevertheless, since Churchill's declaration of loyalty to the Soviets in war, following Germany's attack on Russia, the tendency has been, not only in the direction of friendlier relationships with external forces, many of which had hitherto been inimical, but even toward consolidation and giving permanence to these relationships through agreements which involve mutual acts and even undertakings with common participation and joint responsibility. Such agreements neutralize tension and form an umbrella of political and economic structure under which social and cultural relationships may similarly develop favorably. Politics is the dominant factor in Russia, but so long as political power is not interfered with, other forces have considerable freedom of action. In this respect the freedom of the Church was nominally granted by its separation from the state, but the considerable actual freedom which it

now has has been secured only by a process in which the following stages may be noted: (1) the Church was rendered politically innocuous, and was purged of elements disloyal to the state; (2) there followed a period of probation of loyalty; (3) its usefulness in giving comfort and therefore morale in wartime has later been noted; (4) finally, it has become a factor in restoring loyalty to Moscow on the part of populations reincorporated in the Russian orbit. During the last two stages the will and purpose of the Church itself have been at work, the political objectives of the state being coincidental. Mutual interest in the success of these efforts gives rise to mutual interest in their consolidation by the establishment of theological schools and the regularizing of the ecclesiastical administration, etc. The establishment of a liaison office under Karpov, in October, 1943, was a step toward regularizing relationships and keeping them on a currently active basis. While, on the one hand, this might be interpreted as a measure of state control, on the other, it provides a proper channel through which the interests of the Church may more easily be made known to the Government. There is no reason to believe that greater freedom in the foreign relations of the Russian Orthodox Church may not follow in the same direction as the growing freedom within the country. The limitations circumscribing religious life and church activity within the Soviet Union, viz., limitation to freedom of conscience and freedom for the conduct of worship in the churches, will constitute a handicap if applied also to the range of discussions which the Russian Church may have with foreign churches. But here, as in politics and economics, the Soviet authorities may adhere to their avowed principle that socialist states may exist side by side with non-socialist states, and permit the Russian Church to expand its interests when they appear beyond the confines of the Soviet state. In this case restrictions on the range of relationships will be such as are or may be applied by the Russian Church itself, in light of such factors in its historical and doctrinal position as have been mentioned in this review. Certainly there are grounds on which we may hope that, with the end of the war, the ecumenical movement will be able to make contact with the Russian as well as with those other territorial Orthodox Churches with which it has for years been collaborating.

When the Soviet Government, in June, 1944, announced that it was setting up a state committee to deal with the affairs of the various religious bodies in the Union, Christian, Moslem and Jewish, it gave evidence of applying to these bodies the same general principles as obtain

for the Orthodox. As concerns the sectarian groups the chief difference lies in the fact that they are by nature disparate, as witness their whole history in Russia as abroad; and it is likely that they will therefore not have the inner organization or discipline on the basis of which to establish the relationships achieved through the stages mentioned above. As regards the Roman Catholics, their situation is complicated by the very fact of Papal supremacy, which means that the Roman Catholic Church in Russia cannot confide its whole political loyalty to the Soviet state. An "independent Russian" Roman Catholic Church would be an anomaly, whereas any organized body in the Union, religious or other, which asserts direct loyalty to a power outside the Union is equally unthinkable. This is a problem apart from the oft-reiterated position of the Vatican with reference to communist teaching, which is more dominant now in Russia than ever before, and apart from the fundamental rule in the Roman Catholic Church that it must have control over the education of Catholic children. It is possible that Moscow and the Vatican may achieve some sort of agreement which may be called a concordat, but there is no evidence to date which could give credence to any thought of the Roman Catholic Church gaining a position in the Soviet Union similar to that which is claimed in the abortive Concordat with Yugoslavia or even similar to the unregularized position which it had in France during most of the life of the Third Republic.

Most important in the present situation, and as regards the future, is the tremendous development of popular education in Russia including, since about 1934, a more objective treatment of history, as regards both Russia and the general course of the upward strivings of mankind throughout the human era. These studies will probably have the effect on members of the Russian Orthodox Church, and also on members of the sectarian bodies, which the Renaissance and the Reformation had on members of the Churches of the West. Russians are now given dialectic and logic. As the Church in Russia progressively benefits from this, through the present and successive generations, one may expect that the way will be opened for them to find ideas and a vocabulary which will qualify them for overcoming their old defensive position, and, in the current mood of collaboration instead of conflict, to add their positive and highly valuable contributions to the cause of Christian unity.

CONTEMPORARY BOOKS

PERSONALITY WITHIN THE GODHEAD

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY, *by* LEONARD HODGSON. *Charles Scribner's Sons, $2.50.*

PROFESSOR HODGSON'S purpose in his Croall Lectures has been to present a restatement of the doctrine of the Trinity which will reduce the confusion and indifference concerning it manifest today among the clergy as well as the laity. He seeks to set forth an argument which will be intellectually acceptable without abolishing mystery, and grounded in tradition without being enslaved thereto.

He begins with the thesis that divine activity in history, rather than propositional truth, is the primary form of revelation; and that the doctrine of the Trinity, as "revealed," arose as a result of reflection upon consciousness of adoptive sonship through Christ instead of as a result of metaphysical speculation. Taking this Christian apprehension of the fact and the mode of revelation as a datum, the author then argues that we should revise our conception of unity in its light, instead of attempting, as heresy has done, to force it into a mathematical conception of unity. The result is a doctrine wherein three Persons (in the full sense of the word) are "organically" united with an intensifying power for which there is no earthly parallel. It stands in conflict with those types of philosophy which, from the *Logos* doctrine to Hegelian idealism, have preferred the idea of an impersonal Absolute to that of a personal Creator; but it is not irrational, and it need not conflict with a philosophy which seeks to understand the data of revelation as far as possible, without distorting them or explaining them away. In his rejection of subordinationism and in his ascription of full personality to each of the members of the Godhead, Professor Hodgson claims to be in substantial agreement with Augustine, Aquinas and Calvin, despite their "propositional" views of revelation and their inconsistent attempts to retain the mathematical conception of unity. The careful argument (pp. 144 ff.) to the effect that the analogy between the Godhead and the three "faculties" of the human soul was incidental rather than central in Augustine's thought, is especially worthy of attention. A final chapter brings out some of the practical implications of Trinitarian faith for Christian worship and service; and eight brief, scholarly appendices furnish detailed evidence in connection with various special problems.

The book as a whole is very helpful. Its discussion of opposing philosophical and theological views is candid but courteous; the historical chapters are illuminating and free from pedantry; and the whole argument is

aced in the setting of an attractive view of the relations between revela-
on and reason. Inevitably, however, several queries arise. For one thing, is
not misleading to refer to divine activity in history as "empirical"? No
oubt the author wishes to rescue that ambiguous word from the monopo-
stic claims of contemporary philosophy. But does that justify him in tak-
ig "Christian experience" at its face value at every stage of reflection, as
ell as at the beginning? In short, since non-Christian views (religious and
religious) also appeal to "history" and "experience" in various ways, the
uthor's usage leaves much to be desired. In the second place, would anyone
tempt to develop the difficult notion of three "organically united" Per-
ons unless, so to speak, he had the doctrine of the Trinity "on his hands"?
rofessor Hodgson might reply that he is glad to have it on his hands, since
incorporates the most adequate conception of God. Nevertheless, the at-
mpt to show that his statement of the doctrine is not irrational is hard to
econcile with a notion which really goes *against,* not merely beyond, what
e know concerning the unifying centre of personality and the manner in
hich persons are related to each other. Finally, does not the author intro-
uce the kind of "bad" speculation from which he is trying to rescue the
octrine when he writes (with many precedents in his favour, to be sure)
oncerning the Godhead *apart* from creation (cf. pp. 133, 190)?

Incidentally, his statement about Hastings Rashdall on p. 128 is either an
naccountable mistake, or so brief as to be misleading.

DAVID E. ROBERTS

UNSATISFACTORY ANSWERS TO IMPORTANT QUESTIONS

THE CONDITION OF MAN, *by* LEWIS MUMFORD. *Harcourt, Brace & Co., $5.00.*

READERS of CHRISTENDOM will have already read one or more reviews of Lewis Mumford's latest book, and if they have on that account decided hat this essay need not be studied, I should like to say only so much as might nduce them to change their minds. Very few scholars will agree with Mum-ord's interpretation of history. My own doubts about his novel "twists" are oth numerous and profound. It is precisely for this reason that I feel bliged to read this book. I cannot understand the attitude of critics who eem to have fallen into the habit of writing disparaging reviews of books for o other reason than their personal dislike for the point of view expressed. n my own case, for example, it must be said at the outset that I belong pri-narily to the American pragmatic tradition in philosophy and that Mum-ord definitely does not. The empirical viewpoint is at the moment suffer-ng from intensified criticism coming largely from Catholic and conserva-

tive Protestant sources. It seems to me, therefore, that this is precisely the time when those with pragmatic inclinations should read everything which stands in opposition, and especially when they can read material as thoroughgoing and comprehensive as Mumford's current essay.

A word or two about Mumford's style, which seems to have annoyed some reviewers: he uses stilted phrases and unusual words to which he appears to attach special values; for example when he repeatedly uses the term "idolum" instead of the simpler word "idea," he evidently wishes to convey a shaded meaning. It is never quite clear whether it is his intention to convey the notion that an idolum is less operational than an idea (which would be etymologically correct) or whether he has merely become attached to the rarer word in an esthetic or emotional way. When he employs such awkward phrases as "dynamic syncretism" one may have reason to complain since the idea he wishes to convey here is central to his total philosophy. Perhaps an example will demonstrate to the reader why the matter of style is so important. "A dynamic syncretism of doctrines and creeds and philosophies was needed, if the idolum of the machine was to unite under a new sign with the idolum of the organism." It is easy to become annoyed over sentences of this type but it is also important to understand what the author is striving to say because his basic conceptions are embedded in just such words and sentences.

This is a philosophic interpretation of history and comes naturally and logically in the series which Mumford began almost two decades ago. He boldly announces that he is now dealing, not with the instrumentalities of life, but with life's ends and purposes. It is, so far as I know, the first philosophy of history in which two new strands of culture have been incorporated, namely, the Freudian and the Marxian fields of view. Although Mumford continues to make Freudian applications throughout his text, he does not wish to be classified as a Freudian. Indeed, he scornfully calls Freud an "uncritical mediocrity as a philosopher." Nor is Mumford a Marxist, and he makes a distinction between "basic communism" and what is presumably the superficial variety engendered by the Marxists. The two items of experience which he utilizes much more fully than most philosophic historians, are sex and esthetics.

Perhaps I may add two further interpretations which might create an appetite on the part of the prospective reader. The key to Mumford's perspective is historical continuity, a basic idea which is coming to have a deep influence upon radical thought everywhere. The logical consequence of accepting continuity as the key to history is a new concept of progress. If nothing is lost in this organic conception of history, what shall be retained for emphasis? Progress now becomes a continuing synthesis of certain selected factors in each successive stage of culture. Thus, in our time, for example,

ligion seems to take on a new value. How does this synthetic selection take ace? Who decides what is to survive? Is the process automatic and outside e realm of free will or are people to be trained for this very purpose? The ader will see at once that these are important questions and we should ank Mumford for putting them into our minds. If he does not furnish mpletely satisfactory answers, well and good: so much the better for those no have the will and energy to go to work.

Having spoken of Mumford's answers, I must now conclude my review stating that it is my feeling that the final chapter called *The Basis of Re-wal,* in which Mumford's program is embedded, does not really belong this volume. It constitutes rather a prolegomena for another essay and I ust that he has already begun its outline. The style of this chapter in which umford sets forth his constructive ideas is sermonic and falls below the ndard set in the earlier sections both in content and manner. It is perhaps ough to say that Mumford's program of future action revolves about the ilosophy of Patrick Geddes whom he eulogizes but does not really ex-ain. He claims, for example, that Geddes succeeded in extracting a true nthesis from Comte, Spencer, LePlay, Durkheim and Veblen on the one nd and from Bergson, James, Dewey and Lloyd Morgan on the other. If is has been done, the result should be known and also the process, but umford leaves us with mere assertions. Yes, the more I ponder over this st chapter the more I wish it had not been written, but I fully expect and pe that Mumford will use it as the clue for his next adventure which ould, naturally, fall into the category of a positive philosophy which deals, t with decadence, but with the resurgent potentialities of the future.

EDUARD C. LINDEMAN

JESUS STILL A STRANGER AND AN ENIGMA?

CONTEMPORARY THINKING ABOUT JESUS, *compiled by* THOMAS S. KEPLER. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, $3.50.*

THIS very rich anthology comprises some of the most important and germinal contributions to New Testament criticism and interpretation at have been made in the past two generations, from Albert Schweitzer's *uest of the Historical Jesus* to Dodd's conception of "realized eschatology" id contemporary "form criticism." It also includes some literary interpre-tions of Jesus (Merejkowski), some philosophic discussions of his ethics art IV, Eschatology and Ethics), and a very limited – surprisingly limited range of theological interpretation of his Person and Work (Part V, Mod-n Evaluation).

To this reviewer, the most thought-provoking thing about this anthology the Christology it does not contain. The theme of the supposedly theo-

logical section is set by A. C. McGiffert, Jr.'s provocative essay on "The Significance of Jesus," in which it is confessed, after a review of seven types of Jesus-figure, that the real Jesus is still "to our time a stranger and an enigma," as Schweitzer said over a quarter-century ago. And it is remarked that if this figure still "refuses to be detached from his own time or suffer himself to be modernized," it is hard to see how it can have any meaning for us. That is the challenge which theology must meet, if a Christ hungering to redeem humanity and a human race wandering in confusion, "like sheep without a shepherd" are not to be kept tragically apart. Nothing printed in this anthology adequately meets this challenge.

It is not, I believe, the fault of the anthologist. He has made a pretty fair cross section of prevailing Christian opinion about Jesus, at least so far as American perspectives are allowed to dominate. The Christological work of Emil Brunner (*The Mediator*) and of many British authors (Sidney Cave) might have been allowed to count more heavily in the selection; but the truth is that American Protestantism has not been thinking creatively about Christological questions for over a generation. It is high time a new start was made. High time, because of the world's desperate need of Christ. High time, because the portrait of the historic Jesus which emerges from a reading of this anthology cries aloud for theological interpretation.

WALTER MARSHALL HORTON

PERSONALIST DOCTRINE IMPERILING PERSONAL UNITY

SLAVERY AND FREEDOM, *by* NICOLAS BERDYAEV. *Charles Scribner's Sons, $2.75.*

BERDYAEV'S latest book, completed in Paris in 1939 but not published in English until 1944, is, in the opinion of this reviewer, the clearest, most searching and most constructive work of the Russian philosopher.

D. C. Macintosh in *The Problem of Religious Knowledge* has called Berdyaev an irrationalist. In this book, Berdyaev frankly faces the inconsistencies in his thought, which he ascribes to "a long philosophical journey in search of truth, . . . a long struggle on behalf of transvaluation of values" (p. 7). Berdyaev seems to understand himself better than Macintosh understands him; instead of being an irrationalist, he is really a practical truth-seeker, an empirical rationalist.

The world view at which Berdyaev has arrived, and which is the backbone of both his social and his metaphysical interpretations of slavery and freedom, is "the philosophy of personalism" (p. 7, *et passim*). Despite this commitment, he is suspicious of any system, as something "final and rounded off." He rightly sees that a person is a being which cannot ever be

rounded off," and that "authentic philosophy has always been a conflict" p. 8). Personalism is at once the unity and the strife of "an aristocratic interretation of personality . . . and a socialistic demand for the assertion of ne dignity of every man" (pp. 11, 9). Personalism leads Berdyaev to a clear nd intelligible statement about existentialism. "True integrality of nought," he says, "which is bound up with the integrality of personality, an existential unity, not a logical" (p. 8). In other words, reason is a perpnal experience, not an abstraction. Hegel and Kierkegaard could both ccept good sense like this.

These principles are applied throughout the book. As Hegel points out n his *Phenomenology of Mind,* man is both master and slave. Mastery, or reedom, is primary for Berdyaev over against any abstract view of being pp. 73–76). Man becomes enslaved when he regards being as primary and ccepts a deterministic view of the spirit. Likewise, if God be viewed as subect, as person, he is "love and freedom" (p. 83); but if he be viewed as an bsolute monarch, the result is "theological seduction and slavery" (p. 85). God has not made a slave of man. God is the liberator. Theology has made slave of him" (p. 83). For personalism, "God is not an absolute monarch. God is a God Who suffers with the world and with man" (p. 85). Man, then, by nature free; he becomes a slave when he forgets or denies that he is a ree person. "Objectivization" (that is, an impersonal view), pantheism, and ven "the very idea of world order" are all forms of slavery. "The whole, the world order, cannot justify anything. On the contrary it is in the position f being judged and requires justification" (p. 87). Not even the church can be thought of as a suprapersonal whole"; its "existential center . . . is to e found in every personality in it" (pp. 91–92). But Berdyaev goes too far when he declares that "the very idea of unity is false and enslaving in its onsequences. It is opposed to personalism" (p. 91). This is extreme; surely personality is a unity and can be understood only when it is understood as whole. In his zeal against impersonal unities, Berdyaev imperils personal inity.

The bulk of the book is an acute analysis of the slaveries and "lures" which arise from nature, society, and a false individualism. With penetrating and courageous insight, Berdyaev discusses the slaveries of sovereignty, f war, nationalism, aristocracy, the bourgeois spirit, revolution, collectivsm, sex, and beauty.

Particularly in dealing with war is he remorselessly frank. "War," he says, has become too base a thing, too absolutely evil, to give rise to tragic conlict" (p. 158). "The present-day state and the warfare of today recognize no ersonality at all" (p. 159). "The idea of a 'holy' war was a blasphemous nockery even in the past" (p. 158). "There is nothing more monstrous than he blessing of war by the Christian Church" (p. 161). At the same time,

Berdyaev rejects "bourgeois pacifism," which "may even indicate a baser condition than war" (p. 161). "The real struggle against war," he concludes, "is itself also war, it is the true martial spirit, courage and willingness to accept sacrifice."

In this book issues are sometimes stated in an extreme and exaggerated form; definitions are not always exact; but it is written with a greater concentration of energy and spiritual insight than most books of the last decade. It is worthy of reading and rereading by all who are concerned about the fate of man's spirit in modern civilization.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

EUROPE'S CHURCHES AGAINST NAZISM

CHRISTIAN COUNTER ATTACK, *by* HUGH MARTIN, DOUGLAS NEWTON, H. M. WADDAMS AND R. R. WILLIAMS. *Charles Scribner's Sons, $1.50.*

THE importance of this little volume of contemporary church history is out of all proportion to its size. Its authors — one Baptist (editor of the Christian Student Movement Press), one Roman Catholic, and two Anglicans, have been in a position to examine from month to month all of the available evidences concerning the church struggle which has gone on in Europe under the Nazi blight. What they have set down here is the most significant compact documentation anywhere available of the resistance which the churches have made to the doctrines and politics of Hitler and his associates.

Beginning with an introductory presentation of the broad over-all picture, the volume contains chapters on the situation in Germany itself; in the martyred churches of Poland and Czechoslovakia; in "Christianity's Northern Bulwark" — Norway and Denmark; along "Christianity's Western Wall" — Holland, Belgium, France; among the Orthodox Churches of Yugoslavia, Greece and Occupied Russia; and among "Germany's Uneasy Allies" — Italy, Finland and Hungary. There is a brief "Epilogue concerning the Future" and a convenient index.

Although the situation changes rapidly and the materials in the book come from the recent past rather than the immediate present, it is an essential aid to any reader wishing to understand the remarkable manner in which modern Christianity in its ancient European home has risen to meet a challenge as terrible as it was unexpected. Particular attention is given to the striking and dramatic personal conduct of the men who will go down in history as the leaders of the most persistent and fearless opposition confronted at any point by the paganizing fanatics of Nazism.

The emphasis, therefore, is upon what the churches have been saying and doing rather than upon the deeds and words of their oppressors. In the rec-

d of these tragic years the authors find three major notes. (1) "The Chris-an Church everywhere survives, — in spite of furious and insidious at-cks, such as it has perhaps never had to face since its earliest days." As Miss arbara Ward, an editor of the *London Economist* and a brilliant secretary the Roman Catholic movement known as "The Sword of the Spirit," puts :

> Practically speaking, the only institutions which remain as a continuous link ith Europe's past and all the good in Europe's past, are the Christian Churches. . . . There still exists a great network of organized bodies who speak with the oice of Europe, and which still recognize those loyalties to freedom for which e say we are fighting.
>
> (2) The resistance of the Churches has been primarily on spiritual, not politi-l, grounds. . . . The Nazi challenge has forced the Church to rethink and to formulate its faith; a process which has not led to compromise or modification it to a reassertion of the central verities. The Church has not become funda-entalist in any party sense, but it has returned to the fundamentals.

nd thus, over against the ideology of the "new order," there has risen early and majestically the vision of an ever new and ever old faith in the bsolute sovereignty of God without whom man can neither know nor at-in freedom and order.

(3) "There is a new Christian self-consciousness abroad in the world, a nse of togetherness in Christ." And even between the Catholic and the rotestant Churches this "fellowship has gone further in many lands than any time since the Reformation." The developments in this struggle seem o show that the real choice in our time is between faith and Nihilism. And n the side of faith, Christians of all kinds have found it possible to stand in fraternity broader and more inclusive than anything known for centuries. ndeed the fear of the common enemy seems to have accomplished what the ve of the brethren could not (or at least did not) alone accomplish!

The conclusion to which the authors come as they contemplate the future that the identification of Europe's Christians with their national suffer-ng, and their leadership in national resistance, will win for them a vantage oint from which they can proclaim with assurance their message to peoples ho will find themselves compelled to respect, even when they do not ac-ept, the Christian way.

One who has had, as has the present reviewer, intimate contact with the hurches and the personalities dealt with, and who enjoys the personal riendship of three of the four authors of this little book, cannot but hope hat it will find the wide reading it deserves among those who have known nly by the hearing of the ear the most bitter and moving struggle of this ge of world revolution.

HENRY SMITH LEIPER

RELIGION AS SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

RELIGION AND THE WORLD ORDER, *edited by* F. ERNEST JOHNSON. *Harper & Brothers, $2.00.*

THE Institute for Religious Studies, established at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America to enable ministers of all faiths to study under the guidance of scholars in various fields, offered a series of lectures in the academic year 1942–1943 under the general title "Religion and the World Order." These lectures, which have been brought together in a book under the same title, will serve a valuable purpose in directing attention to significant issues of world order and to needs that must be met to promote its achievement. The separate addresses vary considerably in style and in the extent to which they come to grips with basic problems. The collection as a whole commends itself on numerous counts.

The selection of lecturers to participate in the course offers wide representation in background and in point of view. The participants include university professors and professors of theological seminaries, a college president and a seminary dean, editors, lawyers, a bishop, and the head of a religious center. While the outlook in most instances roots in the Protestant tradition, the stand taken is never sectarian and provision is made to include Catholic and Jewish spokesmen. The contributors, in addition to the editor who gave the first lecture and summarized the series, are: Paul J. Tillich, Luther A. Weigle, Francis J. McConnell, Henry P. Van Dusen, John LaFarge, Ben Zion Bokser, Robert M. MacIver, Raymond Leslie Buell, Lawrence K. Frank, George S. Counts, Clyde Eagleton, John A. Fitch, Edmund de S. Brunner, Clyde R. Miller, and Felix Morley.

Religion is conceived as definitely relevant to every aspect of human affairs. In commenting on the title, the editor suggests that the first two words, "Religion and," are symbolic of a modern mood with respect to religion; for they denote a nexus between the spiritual and the temporal, the sacred and "secular." By specific reference here and there and by clear implication throughout the entire book, the emphasis is placed not so much on the private beliefs of individuals as on the religious fellowship, the community of spiritual aspiration. This inclusive connotation of religion permits the consideration of questions which are normally regarded outside the scope of religious concern — proposals for post-war reconstruction; the political, economic, and cultural bases of reconstruction; education in the post-war world; reconstruction in international law; labor in the post-war world; the emerging role of government; opinion making in the post-war world; lessons from the League of Nations. The development of these broader implications is much needed and will be welcomed by those whose eyes are already somewhat open to see the contributions which religion can make to

orld order. However, since the view that religion is primarily a matter of rivate belief and is to be kept separate from the larger issues of life still ontrols so many people, it is perhaps to be regretted that no forthright eatment of the correlation of religion as individual conviction and religion as social responsibility is provided. Conceivably the advanced state of ie student personnel in the course accounts for this omission.

The extremes of optimism and pessimism, of utopianism and despair, re happily avoided. The theological position announced in Professor Tillich's lecture seems to prevail even when the more concrete social, political, nd economic problems are under consideration:

> Human history is neither a mere progress nor a mere tragedy, but it is a fight etween forces of perfection and those of distortion. . . . The belief in Providence . . . gives the certainty that victory over man's existential distortion is on from the point of view of eternity; but it does not give us certainty that here is or will be a victory at any point of history.

Clear-cut facts, terrifying warnings, and encouraging developments combine to make the reader of this book feel that his personal activity in behalf f world order is urgently needed. Members of the several faiths are called n to deal with specific problems in the light of their respective traditions. he medium of expression is social, but the individual responsibility is inscapable. The tasks of organized leadership — whether in international w, labor, education, or opinion making — must be performed; they cannot be performed effectively unless the mass of individuals play their part.

O. Frederick Nolde

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ECUMENISM

John Dury: Advocate of Christian Reunion, *by* J. Minton Batten. *The University of Chicago Press, $2.50.*

THIS careful study of John Dury appears at a propitious time. No reader of this journal needs to be told that Christendom is emphasizing union nd reunion of churches, co-operation among disparate groups, and ecumenicity more than at any time since the Protestant Revolt. Because of this ct, and because John Dury was the leading proponent of Christian union the seventeenth century, Professor Batten's study is most welcome.

John Dury spent his life trying to unite the great divisions of Protestantm. For this purpose he tried to formulate broad bases of doctrine upon hich Lutherans, Reformed, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Independents could gree. For a half-century (1630–1680) he travelled from England to the conent (Germany, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, France, Switzerland) and

back many times, meeting with groups and individuals in the interest of "ecclesiastical pacification." He must have had tireless energy and dauntless faith. The great fact about Dury was his firm belief that Christians could unite. He was also wise enough to know that shifting emphases in political and religious establishments demanded a variable strategy in union efforts.

John Dury was a product of ecumenical Christianity. His father, Robert Dury, was minister of a Presbyterian English congregation in Leyden. John studied at the University in that city and also at the Huguenot Academy at Sedan. He became minister at Elbing (West Prussia) where he fell under the influence of Samuel Hartlib and the Swedish Privy Councillor, Caspar Godemann, who was representing Gustavus Adolphus' interest in the establishment of peace among the churches. But it was Sir Thomas Roe, English ambassador, whose irenic pursuits led to discussions of co-operation between the Greek Orthodox and Anglican communions, who persuaded Dury to leave the pastorate and embark upon the broader mission of a union of Christendom. To accomplish this he did not hesitate to adapt himself, politically and religiously, to the fashion of society prevalent at the time. He was ordained a Presbyterian minister, but accepted Anglican orders when it seemed that thus his plans would be furthered by Archbishop Laud. Later he was a member of the Westminster Assembly and later still, messenger of Cromwell. The kaleidoscopic political patterns in England from the latter years of Charles I to the Restoration seem to have exerted no permanent check upon the general design and policy of Dury, the "peacemaker without partiality." Often his plans were put aside by interested statesmen because of political pressures. More often, however, leading churchmen designated his ideas as being entirely impracticable. In spite of political chicanery and religious bigotry and suspicion, which resulted in continual postponement of any sort of attempts at union, Dury seems to have maintained his optimistic faith to the end.

Professor Batten rightly shows John Dury as a man of his day. His attitude toward the Jews, based on the hope of their conversion, was not all that could be desired, although he did advocate their readmission to England. Again, in his *Proposals* of 1652, the bases of Christianity excluded Quakers, Unitarians, Anglicans, and Roman Catholics from the establishment which was to be set up! Cromwell felt that such an establishment would be too limited. Dury further subjected himself to criticism because of his too easy loyalty to the various religious communions to which he attached himself. Yet his impelling motive was to be (religiously and politically) all things to all men, if perchance he might win a few to Christian union.

His interests were varied. With Hartlib and Comenius he hoped to inaugurate educational reform. He was one of a very few Protestants concerned about missions. His interest in the readmission of Jews to England has been

ɔted. Even his primary goal of union received changing emphases. At first
e worked to bring about concord between Lutherans and Reformed, then
etween the Presbyterians and Independents in his own land, and toward
ıe end of his life he hoped for *rapprochement* of Protestants and Catholics
ı some Scriptural bases.

Professor Batten has thoroughly investigated the sources for his life of
is seventeenth-century ecumenical Christian. He has supplied a compre-
ensive bibliography and has appended "A Trial List of the Printed Writ-
gs of John Dury." This scholarly work supersedes all other studies of
ury. It is comprehensive, succinct and clear.

MERVIN M. DEEMS

GOSPEL FOR CHRISTIAN PEACE

PEACE THROUGH COOPERATION, *by* J. HENRY CARPENTER. *Harper & Brothers, $1.25.*

CONFUSED and frustrated by the ethereal irrelevance of many books and discussions about the bases of a just and Christian peace, Christians verywhere are seeking authentic and prophetic guidance in translating eir ideals into concrete realities. J. Henry Carpenter's concise testament co-operation is not only a penetrating analysis of the reasons for the fail-re of peace plans which superficially deal with political factors and ignore ıe true causes of war; it points the way to creative Christian action which ts at the real roots and puts brotherhood to work. It is a book which will e received as is Henry Wallace's political leadership — profoundly stimu-ting, productive of zealous evangelistic fervor and vociferous rebuttal. ut it will not be ignored!

Dr. Carpenter brings a fresh wind from the highlands of Christian ideal-m to blow over the discussions of peace. To him, peace is not merely the sence of armed conflict seasoned with economic anarchy, but the state of fairs in which every people and every person may live in loving co-opera-on with the people of every other race and nation. He presents Christian ve as the true basis for all human relationships, showing how fully and chly it may be expressed in co-operation, people working together and anning together because, in the very nature of God's universe, they be-ng together and are members of one true community. The concrete work-g out of the Christian principle of co-operation is impossible in a capital-tic, competitive economy; it is only to be realized in a co-operative onomy. Unless our whole range of common life is transformed into a co-erative expression of the sense of community, we shall inevitably repeat ıe tragic steps which will lead again to war, this time a World War III hich will wipe out all the gains of thousands of years of civilization. The

Christian principles of meekness, justice, loving brotherhood, expressed in concrete co-operation on the levels where all peoples live, are the only dam which can stem the rising flood of destruction. An impressive documentation showing how co-operatives have transformed the life of the people in Scandinavia, Nova Scotia, and to a lesser extent in other lands, provides a convincing demonstration of the soundness of Dr. Carpenter's thesis. Man's true dominion over the earth — creative, constructive, god-like dominion, depends at last not upon brute force, or upon selfish and competitive exploitation, but upon full application of Christian co-operation in action, in all human relationships.

Dr. Carpenter writes from no ivory tower. His many years as executive secretary of the Brooklyn Federation of Churches have permitted him to see at first hand the final working out of a competitive economy among the people who are its victims rather than its beneficiaries. His book is a Christian statesman's answer to some of the conditions so poignantly portrayed in *A Tree Grows in Brooklyn*. His wide observation and prolonged study of co-operatives in action give him a voice of authority. His style is pungent, and his impressive and cumulative questionings on page after page of this little book, pour iodine on the wounds of the world.

No minister, no thoughtful Christian, no study group on Christian action, can afford to miss a careful reading of this book. Those who read will feel that they have been exposed to Christian idealism at its warm-hearted and practical best, and have been guided into paths where creative action is possible and mandatory.

EDWARD K. ZIEGLER

AN EXILE ADDRESSES THE WORLD

PLEA FOR LIBERTY. LETTERS TO THE ENGLISH, THE AMERICANS, THE EUROPEANS, *by* GEORGE BERNANOS. *Translated from the French by* HARRY LORIN BINSSE. *Pantheon Books, Inc., $3.00.*

BERNANOS is one of the outstanding serious novelists of France, a Catholic with a profound historical sense and a love of the peasantry and the poor. This book is made up of letters written in exile to peoples indicated in the subtitle. Anyone interested in the fall of France and its historical implications, and in the responsibilities and danger of peace when it comes, should surely read at least parts one and two of the book. Those of us for whom France has been our first love outside our own land will agree with the writer when he says (and extend its implication to include the whole Western world), "My country is the heart and conscience of Europe, which does not mean that it is any better than the rest, but merely that it

reacts more vigorously to what is good and bad. It first falls sick and is the first to be cured."

His analysis of the responsibilities for the collapse of France concerns all of us. He sees the ancient Catholic peasantry of France, indeed the people as a whole, as sound. But the last two hundred years has witnessed the rise to power of a bourgeoisie mediocre in its values, subordinating all things to its attachment to property. The common people, "the little people," are a reservoir of idealism: it produces its Jeanne d'Arc, its Thérèse de Lisieux; it is Christendom on the march, yes, even in the French Revolution and in the League of Nations. It took over from its hesitant leaders and won the first World War, animated by its deep instincts for justice. It is the carrier into the modern world of the ancient traditions of chivalry and honor. But after 1918 the false elite, the custodians of its conscience, confused it and led it into disenchantment and disgust, and betrayed it. In the present adversities it will find itself and we shall see it emerge with great moral energies. Indeed, we Americans are bidden to beware of Europe. Its old peoples, some of them, may perhaps be younger than we are after this renewal, and give us lessons in liberty.

In his identification of the false leaders Bernanos draws no simple picture of Catholic versus free-thinker. Many Christians are guilty with the rest. Nor does he find his villains in a few individuals. He also rejects the view of the moralists who offer impressive but vague theories of the decadence of culture. He accuses certain elements of the bourgeoisie who have been able to place their men in positions of authority in politics, education, journalism, the army. This class, attached to its comfort and its property, found itself slowly alienated from the people; developed a bad conscience because of its materialism; was embittered by the insecurity of its wealth after the first World War; found itself on the defensive against the leftist tendencies of the people; chose to identify these leftist pressures with communism; abused its power; and finally as its own weakness grew apparent it preferred the help of the foreigner, of Hitler, to any surrender of its privilege. "It broke the national covenant; for its own purposes it used the enemy against the nation."

Everything which goes by the name Right, extending from the alleged monarchists of the Action Française to the allegedly "national" Radical-Socialists — big industry, big business, the higher clergy, the Academies, the general staffs — spontaneously gathered and took shape around my country's disaster, like a swarm of bees clinging to its queen. I do not say that they wished disaster, by a deliberate act of will. They expected it. This monstrous expectation passes judgment on them.

The present preachments of Vichy in the name of Property, Order, Work,

Family (*with* appeasement and capitulation) are the natural slogans of a group in whose eyes in the day of their power, "a single undisciplined action had more importance than a hundred abuses of power." And this same group both in peace and after the occupation, has had its Christian supporters. The accused elements have easily exploited the support of mediocre Christians, of "political" Catholics. They think thereby that they have the Church with them. But all that they have is a mass of men even more fickle than most, since a poor Christian is under double judgment. Bernanos indicts the Catholic support of Franco, of Mussolini, of Vichy, and warns Roosevelt against uninformed Catholic opinion in the United States. He is stern against Catholic groups, belonging rather to the body than to the soul of the Church, which think to gain recruits by playing on the fear of revolution, or those which "leave slightly ajar — to the greater glory of God — the door through which come to them so many powerful allies." For the soul of the Church is there biding its time, and when it speaks all such equivocations suffer a terrible judgment.

Parts of the book represent prophetic political writing of the first order. It is strange that there has been so little adequate analysis of the events of our times. An American must feel a certain bitterness that no similar truth has been written about our case in these recent years, with a comparable force: "We see not our signs: there is no more any prophet." It should have been some American rather than a Frenchman to tell us with this finality that the responsibility of peoples for one another is not fulfilled by signing checques, that privilege in one land will always condone the abuses of privilege in another, that justice is more important than order, and to reassure us that though it was the democracies that made Munich, it is the peoples that are in process of making victory.

Those who have read Jacques Maritain's *A travers le désastre* will compare the two books with interest. Maritain agrees in defending the French people as a whole against foolish charges that have been brought against its fundamental moral soundness. He lists certain weaknesses here, however. For Bernanos there is evidently no original sin, and he is not quite convincing in his picture of so noble a people being duped and confused in their consciences. Moreover his idealization of the older pre-Revolution France — the French popular monarchy he calls his loyalty — and his negative definition of democracy as "the political form of capitalism," indicate a special approach to his themes that calls for scrutiny. Thus he fails to appreciate the real Christian leaven in bourgeois institutions as we know them in Anglo-Saxon Protestant lands. Nevertheless, his final emphasis on the creative potentialities of the common people, though seen in feudal terms, is valid and magnificently stated.

AMOS N. WILDER

A GUIDE BOOK FOR AMERICA

T V A — Democracy on the March, *by* David E. Lilienthal. *Harper & Brothers, $2.50.*

THIS is the record of what has been done in ten years to give new life not only to the people of the Tennessee Valley but to all America.

David Lilienthal is that rare combination of philosopher and man of action. When the President entrusted America's most inclusive social experiment to him and his colleagues neither the chief executive nor Senator Norris nor the most optimistic member of Congress dared to expect that such results would follow. True, the author of this exciting and romantic story of modern times is not solely responsible. In fact to read the account one would think this was being presented by a warm friend of the T V A, privileged to enjoy close relations with it, rather than by the present Chairman of the organization. For as the title implies, the author and his colleagues are not nearly so impressed by the size of the dams and the increased crop production through the famous T V A phosphate, as they are in the implications of all these achievements for the democratic way of life.

The key to the story is the borrowed words "not only for the people but by the people." Let one illustration suffice. The objection among power companies to lowering rates as a means of increasing use of power held its use to a low level. The T V A principle of benefiting the greatest number of people broke the jam and the rates came down. One power company, though thirtieth in size in the nation, immediately became first in total number of ranges sold. Though power was not the first objective of T V A according to the Act of Congress creating it, nevertheless this servant of mankind has been put to work in a measure not dreamed of. The famous "yardstick rates" have benefited both public and private power distributors.

The political scientist debates the merits of centralized authority in government. Here is a record of successful action in state-federal relationships with the minimum of delay due to "approvals" and red tape. Politics gives way to merit appointments. As the author says, "A river has no politics." Locating and building a dam is not a political matter. Whether a river should be developed is.

The almost unbelievable achievements of the T V A cannot be condensed for review. Flood control, high phosphate fertilizers, increase of perishable products because of the quick-freeze process, farm and kitchen machinery developed, river navigation, demonstration farms, lessened labor, greater income, heightened hope and concern for one's government — these are but part of the record. This is the story of a river and all the life adjacent to it.

It is the story of a section fabulously wealthy in natural resources and

beauty and tragically poor in terms of per capita wealth. It is also America's "population reservoir" and the kind of people who come from it have a profound influence on the areas to which they go. However, because of the T V A fewer of these people of the Southeast will either have to go, or want to go, elsewhere.

Here is the answer to the timely question of government and business. With the blinders of prejudice removed, men of integrity and vision can work for the welfare of all concerned with subsequent mutual satisfaction. Another delicate area is that of federal-state relationships. A determination to make use of local and state agencies whenever possible has kept the T V A singularly free from accusations of power-usurpation and has brought local self respect.

One great lesson learned has been the realization that only where the planners have authority to deal with the *total* life of a region without divided authority can the *total* welfare be benefited. Training apprentice craftsmen for dam construction is of a piece with moving cemeteries on land needed for flooding. Over all is one concept — the well being of the people of a region. Under such a commission the *how* of doing it is more important than the accomplishment itself. For unless the people for whom all this is being done sense their relationship to it, the results are enervating and but lead to docility, which means the undermining of the ideal. "It is the people or nothing."

Can men be trusted for such a task? We have come to distrust the disinterestedness of leaders because of the apparent decline of the democratic ideal. Here is the proof that, given the responsibility with a broad mandate, including the nature of the task to be performed and general policies to be followed, there can be found countless capable individuals to match the ideal.

By consistently pursuing the democratic ideal the greed of a few political leaders has been brought into full exposure. The chairman of the T V A can let the record speak for itself. Ultimately a free people and their representatives will choose wisely.

Again and again the author points out that what can be done in the valley of the Tennessee can be done elsewhere; but it cannot be done *for* a people. You cannot separate the ideal from the *way* of accomplishing that ideal. "Engineers can build us great dams, but only a great people make a valley great."

Though nowhere does this book claim to have religious significance, it is nevertheless of major importance to those who desire that basic human rights find expression. Freedom of the spirit may find expression under serfdom but when the whole range of life is determined not *for* but *by* one's self and in co-operation with one's fellowmen, there cannot but be a release

of qualities less fully exercised heretofore. Though significant now, the presentation of this record of modern achievement will be of even greater importance for the post-war period. As the author suggests, following the war and a period of destruction there will come a wave of disillusionment. If we can direct our attention to constructive and positive things the energies otherwise turned toward further destruction can be harnessed for the good of all mankind. The people of America, and of every part of the globe, will have increasing cause to be grateful for this convincing evidence of a superbly written firsthand account of what democracy can mean.

VICTOR OBENHAUS

THE CASE FOR IMMORTALITY

JERUSALEM THE GOLDEN, *by* ARTHUR WENTWORTH HEWITT. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, $1.50.*

THIS is a fresh breeze, not to say a strong gale, from the hills of Vermont. It is an argument of the case for immortality and the author deals with all difficulties and objections with a vigorous hand. His weapons are mace and battle-axe and sledge hammer, and yet throughout runs a note of tenderness and poetry with the skillful interweaving of the verses of the noble hymn of Bernard of Cluny which gives the book its name.

The argument will be comfort and reassurance to those who already believe. The great problem is what mode of statement will convince the unbeliever. Often no mode of statement will do so. The experience of sorrow and the death of loved ones will do what no verbal argument can. As Dean Inge says in his little book, *Personal Religion and the Life of Devotion,* written out of his own sorrow: "Bereavement is the deepest invitation into the mysteries of human life, an invitation more searching and profound than even happy love. Love remembered and consecrated by grief, belongs, more clearly than the happy intercourse of friends, to the eternal world; it has proved stronger than death." And Berdyaev says:

> The true center of life is transferred to another world. As we turn aside from the life of this world our whole attention is fixed upon the unfathomable and ineffable; everywhere we are in contact with the mysterious and we see the light of another world, in which nothing ever comes to an end and which knows no subordination. This world is open to the light, it has no limits, it penetrates into other worlds and they in turn penetrate into it.

One great difficulty in thinking and speaking of immortality and of the Life Beyond is the fact that our language is of necessity made up of metaphors of time and space; while immortality and the Life Beyond transcend

time and space and all human language. We need constantly to keep in mind Horace Bushnell's doctrine of language set forth in briefest form in his sermon, "Our Gospel and Gift to the Imagination." We must needs think and speak in the only language we have, but we need also to be always on our guard lest we treat our time and space concepts as inclusive instead of merely and inadequately suggestive. They are valid as far as they go but the truth lies beyond and above them.

The author sets forth some eschatological speculations which will seem doubtful to some readers. He says he is done with those which he sets down about to "intermediate state" – after he has set them down. He is such a hearty believer and such a lusty disputant that one cheers him on. He is a doughty and wholly fearless advocate and he clears away much underbrush in his argument. There are unbelievers who need to be dealt with in his vigorous way.

ROBERT E. SPEER

A GOODLY HERITAGE

THE THRILL OF TRADITION, *by* JAMES MOFFATT. *The Macmillan Company. $2.00.*

TRADITION has borne a bad name among Protestants. Did not the Reformers seek to free the Church from its corrupting influence? Did not our Lord plainly declare, "Ye have made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition"? It is this traditional view which Dr. Moffatt sets out to correct in a book which ranges delightfully over the centuries of thought from Plato to the present day. It is sad to realize that this is the last work we shall have from his richly stored mind.

His purpose is to give the word its true meaning. Particular traditions may be good or bad. But Tradition as the process of communicating truth, oral or written, is the basis of all knowledge. It is "the pulse of the timeless in time." It binds us in living continuity with the past and with the future. It guards us from too easy acceptance of notions that are momentarily popular but are current, transitory.

He approaches the subject by way of Plato and the Academy, and goes on to discuss the esoteric tradition claimed by the mystery cults of the first century, and then the development of tradition among Mohammedans and Jews. Against this background he paints the Christian tradition, which is the revelation of God in Christ, and follows it down through the centuries to the Roman Catholic definition at Trent and to the battle of the Reformers. The rest of the book is devoted to considerations regarding the tendency of all traditions to become "traditional," dead. "To grow and glow they require loyalty; and loyalty implies a mind open to the ends which tra-

ditions are designed to serve." Such living tradition is the sure guide to the future because it does not lose touch with the past.

It is interesting to note that, with all its wealth of examples of traditions both religious and secular, the book never once mentions the universal Christian tradition of the Lord's Day. Here surely is a living tradition — or is it now only traditional?

FLOYD W. TOMKINS

THE MYSTIC AND THE SAINT

THE RADIANT LIFE, *by* RUFUS M. JONES. *The Macmillan Company, $2.00.*
ON BEGINNING FROM WITHIN, *by* DOUGLAS V. STEERE. *Harper & Brothers, $1.50.*

RUFUS JONES has taught us to anticipate his books. His writings in the general area of mysticism are among the best on this perplexing theme that have come out of our day. The present volume should be read as a popular exposition of a view which he has given more thorough and scholarly treatment elsewhere, i.e., *Studies in Mystical Religion.* The book is a series of lectures with one or more magazine articles thrown in to complete the picture. The intent of the book is plain: to humanize the reality of first-hand experience of God. I do not see how anyone can read the chapter entitled "Authentic Tidings" and not be moved to a careful re-evaluation of the message of mysticism.

Another chapter, "The Eternal Significance of Life," will arouse a hot argument from science-worshippers (if any such have survived the last decade!). Dr. Jones makes the familiar and perilous distinction between two kinds of knowledge: (1) observation and exact description from the outside — the spectator kind; (2) the method of vital experience — the participant kind. He argues that our acceptance of the first kind as the only true knowledge "lies at the heart of our world tragedy." Dr. Jones would be right if he were asserting that there is no single road to knowledge, but I very much distrust the distinction he draws. It is now quite clear that the scientist is, to a remarkable extent, a participant in his experiments since he chooses; he is, in fact, the angle of perspective from which the observations shall be made. His experiments are *his* manipulation of materials in order to discover other facets of fact about them. Likewise, the mystic is a spectator of as well as participant in the ecstasy. He prepares, registers, recalls, resolves, and observes — all in terms of an encompassing experience. Dr. Jones' two types of knowledge are in reality two sides of the same coin of knowledge.

The climax of the book is the Ingersoll Lecture on Immortality, "The Spell of Immortality." Rich in wit and anecdote, firmly grounded in reason, insight, and faith, it deserves a careful reading in these days when death is trying to rule the world. Dr. Jones' thesis is simple: the spell of immortality

is "the usual, the normal, result" of the mystical experience of union wit Eternity. He asks, "Has this universe a single story to it, or is it a world o two levels?" and answers that as God is God we "have a two-storied un verse with a Home in it for all we love and a Garden in it greater than Eden where transplanted human worth *will* bloom to profit otherwheres."

Douglas V. Steere's book develops the theme that the initial and inescap able task of religion is to produce saints, i.e., men and women wholly de voted, receptive, and responsive to God. He believes that this emphasis is necessary corrective of two exaggerated tendencies in contemporary the ology: a social gospel which exalts brotherhood at the expense of individu ality; a transcendentalism which exalts God at the expense of any vital per sonal relationship with him. Both groups, he believes, are bogging dow in their own excesses because they ignore the fact that the transformed lif — transformed by and in God — is the primary aim of the Christian faith.

Dr. Steere does some solid and convincing thinking along this line. H outlines the nature of the Saint, the Saint's conflict with and contributio to society, and the actual authority of the Saint. He suggests a new set of de votional exercises which will encourage one toward Sainthood. Only on who has given them a long-time trial can pass on their value. There can b no extended argument over the general thesis that devotion is the fountai of theology. The perennial problem of religion is how to keep that fountai open. The forms and habits of devotion are both essential yet a constan menace to its vitality. Dr. Steere is pointing up a real problem here. His fin discussion of death as the illumination of life will be widely studied an helpful among Christians everywhere.

HAROLD BOSLEY

OLD TRUTHS AND NEW MEANINGS

LIFE'S UNANSWERED QUESTIONS, *by* HAROLD COOKE PHILLIPS. *Harper & Broth ers, $1.50.*

DATE WITH DESTINY, *by* RALPH W. SOCKMAN. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Pres $1.50.*

BOOKS reveal minds as well as meanings. Two books by two of the ou standing preachers in America offer a study in approach and interpreta tion which I found very interesting. These volumes deal not only with th transcendent issues of our time, but also disclose the texture of the mind which produced them. They have one central thing in common: they ar not static minds but minds in quest of old truths and new meanings.

Dr. Phillips' book is based on sixteen key questions found in the Scrip tures. It begins with the question, "Can ye not discern the signs of th times?" and concludes with, "Why seek ye the living among the dead?" Suc

questions as "Where art Thou?" "Where is thy brother?" "Where is God?" "What think ye of Christ?" and "What is your life?" indicate the areas of exploration.

Several impressions crystallized with the reading of this book. (1) Simplicity and clarity characterize the author's style. Any minister would profit by reading these sermons with this achievement in mind. (2) The treatment is especially timely. The questions uncover age-old inquiries that must have a modern answer. (3) The writer makes excellent use of Biblical stories and truths, interweaving them with rare skill into personal and social situations. (4) One of the distinctions of these sermons is the stout insistence that the personal and social gospels are integral parts of the original message of Jesus. This is not new but nevertheless needed. (5) Without dull or dogged authoritarianism, the author makes Jesus the living answer to every throbbing question of our day. Commendable as these sermons are, the reader feels that they do not measure up in convincing and challenging power to the original spoken message. The printed page can never reproduce the pulpit utterance, can never recapture the tone of moral conviction and the contagion of tested experience which make preaching authentic and compelling.

For the Fondren Lectures in 1943 Dr. Sockman took as his theme, *Date With Destiny*. It is the Christian amplification of the Preamble of the Federal Constitution. The chapter headings are indicated by the following phrases: We the People of the United States . . . in order to form a more perfect Union . . . establish Justice . . . insure domestic Tranquility . . . provide for the common defense . . . promote the General Welfare . . . secure the Blessings of Liberty . . . to ourselves and our Posterity.

The author is not a stranger in the modern world. As a minister in New York City and as a radio voice heard each Sunday by millions, he sees the contemporary issues of war and peace, capital and labor, racial and national tensions, and the competing ideologies of the day against the Christian background of the New Testament. Our secular and materialistic philosophies, he insists, cannot meet the deeper demands of the spirit. The value of the book is in vivid and incisive picturing of the American scene and its constructive interpretation of the part the Christian dynamic must play in individual and social regeneration.

Dr. Sockman's clever skill of pithy and epigrammatic expression is not lacking in this volume. Some of the following excerpts may whet the reader's desire to read the book for himself: "You cannot indoctrinate with dynamite"; "We are designed to be spans in the bridge of purposes stretching across the generation"; "One factor in freeing us from want is freeing us from wanting"; "A few years ago we held before our people a prosperity

promising 'two cars in every garage and a chicken in every pot' — this fo mula has been revised so that for the time being it may be said 'the chicker are in the garage and the cars have gone to pot.' "

LLOYD E. FOSTER

A PECULIAR VERSION OF PERSONAL RELIGION

REVIVALISM IN AMERICA, *by* WILLIAM WARREN SWEET. *Charles Scribner's Son $2.00.*

THE author says that his book "is not a history of American revivalism rather it is an attempt at an historical appraisal." He has, nevertheles compressed the essential materials from his more voluminous works, an from the special studies with which he is pre-eminently familiar, into well-balanced account comprehending the origin, growth and decline c the revival method in America. The story is not novel and the style is tha happy blend of narrative and characterization, of events and men, wit enough direct quotation to give flavor to the material, which we hav learned to associate with Dr. Sweet.

At the core of revivalism the author finds "personal emphasis in religion, making salvation dependent upon individual decision. His more forma characterizations expand this thesis. Revivalism was the product of an ind vidualistic age and the religious sanctions to which it appeals where individu alistically expressed. But this was never the whole story, as Dr. Sweet's chap ter on "The By-Products of Revivalism" witnesses. Revivalism showed un canny capacity for direct influence in many directions beyond those stresse in the central appraisal; such as theology, higher education, home mission reform movements, and the anti-slavery impulse in particular. In brief, it near affinities, if not its central qualities, were much more numerous tha the author's formulation recognizes.

There is surely enough of truth in the author's explanation of the de cline of revivalism to compel serious second thought.

> This has been due, partially at least, to the stabilization of American societ and to the change in the cultural climate. No longer is church membership pr marily a matter of individual decision, as it once was, but rather it has becom increasingly a matter of social pressure. In many places personal religion ha given way to institutionalized religion; inner piety to outward conformity. Th emphasis in most of the best preaching of the past generation has been impe sonal; stressing social ills rather than personal sin, and the doctrine of conve sion, so much stressed by our fathers, is no longer even mentioned in the be pulpits (p. xiii).

But the contrast between personal and institutionalized religion, betwee inner piety and outer conformity, is certainly somewhat inept in this co

text. Revivalism was a most intense form of social pressure. The camp meeting and the later professional evangelistic campaigns — to say nothing of the gospel hymn business — were as truly institutions as the most stodgy ecclesiastical structures. Their heightened individual emotion was obviously brought about by crowd psychology, and their experiences, undergone by one person after another, were imitatively adopted and socially patterned in an extreme degree. It might be reasonably argued that revivalism gave really less opportunity for a freely expressed individual version of salvation than the looser methods of religious culture which liberalism has fostered.

Dr. Sweet's conclusion is sound and well balanced. "If religion is to continue as a vital force in America it must not lose the personal individual emphasis. At the same time it must concern itself about the sins of society" (p. 182). This conclusion is reached by dubious arguments in which individualism and a dynamic society are cited as though there were some inherent relationship between them — which Russia conspicuously contradicts — and concepts of "the personal" and of democracy are brought rather confusedly into the discussion. The author might well have made a more thoughtful and cautious use of the main psychological and sociological terms in which his appraisal is expressed.

HARLAN PAUL DOUGLASS

GOSPEL AND CHURCH AS ANTITHESES

PROTESTANTISM: A SYMPOSIUM, *edited by* WILLIAM K. ANDERSON. *Commission on Courses of Study, The Methodist Church, Nashville, $2.00.*

THIS book is a unique testimony to the ecumenical spirit of our generation. It is a symposium sponsored by the Commission on Courses of Study of the Methodist Church, and designed for the extension education of its own ministers. I myself began to read the volume with only the merest glance at the title page and had read over half the book before its Methodist sponsorship became evident. In the first third of the book, dealing with the history of Protestantism, and in the closing section, entitled *Opportunities,* at least six other denominations are represented among the authors — Baptist, Congregational, Episcopalian, Lutheran, Presbyterian and Reformed.

The clergy of the Methodist Church are to be congratulated upon a volume of such worth for study. Indeed, while it may be doubted that this is the definitive book of our time on Protestantism, it deserves a wide reading among American churchmen generally. So far as its Methodism is concerned, this is almost too modestly presented even by the Methodist authors. Wesleyan theology has itself turned ecumenical. As one writer remarks (p. 133), the once seemingly unbridgeable theological chasm in Protestantism, that between Calvinism and Arminianism, has not prevented Presby-

terians and Methodists from coming together in our own time in the United Church of Canada.

A strong reaffirmation of the basic principles of the Protestant Reformation is needed, particularly if we note the increasing power wielded in America by the Roman Church. The essays in this volume exhibit, indeed, a curious reticence in discussing our contemporary Roman problem, although they are virulent enough in denouncing the errors of Rome of the Reformation era. Dr. Báez-Camargo, however, in presenting Protestantism's opportunities in Latin America, speaks out boldly. Dr. William Warren Sweet, dealing with Protestantism in American history, is also frank in stating the fears of many an American as he witnesses growing Romanist controls: "Roman Catholics are always strong protagonists of religious liberty when they are in the minority, as in the United States, but fundamentally the Roman Catholic position is one of intolerance. Therefore, when Roman Catholics are in the majority, it is their duty to see to it that the true religion, or Roman Catholicism, triumphs and controls" (p. 104). This dogma of the Roman Church is beginning to have ominous meanings in once Protestant America.

One could wish that the volume had given more space to our contemporary Protestant-Catholic tension. In terms of the sixteenth century, the treatment of this problem looms large, and the historical first third of the book is a brilliant series of "apologies" for the major Reformation traditions and their respective breaks with the Medieval Church. Lutheranism, for example, is presented by A. R. Wentz; Zwinglianism by G. W. Richards; Anglicanism by A. C. Zabriskie (as an Anglican, I can testify to the adequacy of this essay); Calvinism by Georgia Harkness (a Methodist evaluation full of generous, though critical, insight); Independency by J. M. Batten (a sympathetic illumination of an undervalued area of Protestant Church life). Such a return to historical foundations is, of course, always valuable for any understanding of Protestantism. But ours is the twentieth, not the sixteenth, century. What is the vocation of Protestantism today? Must it always define itself in terms of an antithesis to an historical error? What happens when the "thesis" is forgotten, or is no longer there, or is itself reformed?

When read with such questionings in mind, this symposium still leaves me considerably unsatisfied. There is not very much prophecy in it, nor very much self-criticism. This is not to say that these notes are wholly lacking. They are there, particularly in the essays of Part II, grouped together under the title *Interpretations*. I merely hunger for much more of such critical, rather than descriptive, or even self-laudatory, analysis. Protestantism is not as safe and triumphant as this symposium would suggest to an unwary reader.

Having said this, I hasten to praise the insights of the writers. I shall single out only a few of their essays for specific mention: The calm discussion of "The Bible in Protestantism" (W. G. Chanter); "Christian Theology" (H. F. Rall), (the most solid and ultimately rewarding essay, in my opinion, in the whole volume); "Worship and the Sacraments" (O. T. Olson); "The Mystical Spirit" (W. E. Hocking); and, in the closing section of the book, "Protestantism's Opportunities" – in the Far East (K. S. Latourette), in Europe (H. S. Leiper), in Latin America (Báez-Camargo), in American Education (E. C. Colwell). The book closes on a hopeful and joyous note with an essay by H. P. Van Dusen on "A Growing Ecumenicity."

A symposium is a type of literature which often raises more problems than it settles. The mere juxtaposition of writers of differing points of view rouses to argument. This volume suggests many questions. I shall mention only one – a question which comes particularly easy to an Anglican reviewer. Just what will Protestantism do with the doctrine of the Church? This series of essays exhibits the familiar fact that Protestantism has not really settled matters with this doctrine as yet. The Church is mentioned here and there, but rather warily and in the mood of an "of course." But is the "of course" justified? For what is the place then of the doctrine which in this symposium, as generally in Protestant apologetic, is placed first in the rank of Protestant convictions – namely, "the immediacy of man's relation with God"? (See pp. 2, 126, 218 and *passim*.)

Has Protestant theology ever fully subjected its tendency to atomistic individualism to the judgment of the Bible? This failure constitutes the Achilles' heel of Protestantism. As one of the essayists in this symposium himself puts it: "The Lord's Prayer is all 'we' and 'our,' not 'I' and 'mine.' The command is 'Love . . . thy God . . . and thy neighbor.' The Bible knows nothing of solitary religion." (H. F. Rall, p. 152.)

P. T. Forsyth, possibly the greatest evangelical theologian of the past generation, in *The Church and the Sacraments,* brings this dilemma of Protestant conviction boldly into the open. One of his brilliant epigrams runs: "The Reformation made religion personal; it did not make it individualist." Might this not be a corrective to Protestantism's atomistic tendencies and lead to a recovery of the New Testament doctrine of the church? The Reformers revolted against the Church as an impersonal institution (sacerdotalism, substance-sacraments). Did they intend their revolt to turn against the people-church herself? The fact remains, however, that such has been the mistaken result of much Protestant thought. Gospel and church have been placed over *against* each other. Protestantism's greatest need is a recovery of the social nature of the gospel, which is something else than the "social gospel." To cite once more Dr. Rall's masterly essay in this symposium:

Evangelical theology must recognize more fully the truth in the Catholic tradition. It must protest as much as ever against the idea of a priestly-sacramentarian, legalistic institution and the claims of infallibility and absolute power. But it must see that the personal relationship in religion not only reaches up to God, but also reaches out to men, that Christianity is fellowship-creating, and that the supreme human fellowship is that of faith and love in the Church that Christ is continually creating by his spirit. And we must make more use of "the great tradition," beginning with the Christian Scriptures but including also the treasures of the church of the centuries — its saints and martyrs, its hymns and prayers, and its insights into Christian truth as they come to us in the historic creeds and the great Christian writings (p. 158).

THEODORE O. WEDEL

THE EVANGELICAL ROOTS OF DEMOCRACY

CHRISTIANITY AND DEMOCRACY, *by* JACQUES MARITAIN. *Translated by* DORIS C. ANSON. *Charles Scribner's Sons, $1.25.*

TO many readers Professor Maritain has become the best-known interpreter of neo-Thomist thought. It is perhaps most accurate, if one is to classify him, to associate him with the personalists. At any rate this kinship gives a key to his philosophy of democracy, to the exposition of which, this little volume of barely ninety pages contributes much.

We stand, M. Maritain believes, at the end of an age, in a situation full of portent and shot through with contingency: "History is moving like an avalanche toward good and toward evil." Man's recourse is to hope and a robust will. "The obscure hope of millions of men is at work in the underground recesses of history."

M. Maritain hates totalitarianism, but he is not blind, as many are, to the anomalous alliance between the interests of privileged classes, "crazed by a blind fear of Communism," and utopian ideals; nor to the equally anomalous repudiation of the Christian Gospel "in the name of human liberty." He quotes Pius XI as saying, "The great scandal of the nineteenth century is that the Church lost the working class." The roots of democracy are, the author contends, evangelical, and its future is bound up with that of the "evangelical message." To be sure, he believes that democracy can be expressed in a variety of political forms, and peoples must make their own choice; but such choice can bring no lasting peace unless respect for human dignity and "the rights of the person" are entrenched. Christianity is not linked to democracy, but democracy to Christianity — not as a religious creed, but as "leaven in the social and political life of nations and as bearer of the temporal hope of mankind."

Society is organic and it has been the function of Christianity to inform, by a sort of "hidden work," the secular conscience with a true understand-

ing of human dignity, freedom and fellowship. The author condemns Communism on philosophical and religious grounds, rather than economic. Even so, the Communists have "won the right to take part in the work of reconstruction as companions in arms" and we should accept their co-operation while refusing to unite in a "single political front."

To this reviewer's mind the following passage embodies one of the deepest and most significant insights anywhere to be found:

> I say that the man of common humanity is not possessed of a less sound judgment and less equitable instincts than those social categories which believe themselves superior, and that, taken all in all — not because he is more intelligent but because he is less tempted — he has less chance of going astray in the major issues which concern him, the common man, than the so-called elite of informed and competent and rich and high-born and highly cultivated or highly cunning persons who have cut themselves off from the people, and whose political imbecility, baseness of soul, and corruption are today astounding the universe. . . . Now, whether we will or no, and in accordance with an essential postulate of democratic thought, the new leadership must come forth from the depths of the nations. It will be composed of the working and peasant elite, together with the elements of the former leading classes which have decided to work with the people.

F. Ernest Johnson

UNSURPASSED DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE

Living Abundantly, *by* Kirby Page. *Farrar & Rinehart, $2.50.*

THIS new book by Kirby Page is unsurpassed devotional literature. Its theme stems from the words, "I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly." Seeking to understand what this has implied in the experience of men, he ranges through Christian history to discover how the words have burned themselves in human hearts. The book does not follow a systematic or pedantic chronology. Rather it seeks to illuminate the rich meanings of the varieties of spiritual insight.

Anthologies always tempt the critical reader to probe the principle of selection. Mr. Page is amazing in his ability to make his choices not only comprehensive but selective. This reader thought of many selections which might have been added; he found none which did not belong in the book. It contains selections, poetry, prayers — all well arranged and systematically indexed. It includes contributions from saints, mystics, practical reformers, social prophets — all of whom have learned something about abundant living. To mention specific names and references would be merely to list a long roster of men who have learned the meaning of abundant living.

This book will have many uses. It will find its place on a bedside table, on the desk of the leader of a discussion group, in the church library, in the

classroom. But more important than its practicality is its power to strengthen and to develop the spiritual life.

JOHN C. SCHROEDER

PASS THIS AMMUNITION

IN QUEST OF A KINGDOM, *by* LESLIE E. WEATHERHEAD. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, $2.00.*
BEYOND THE DARK, *by* ELMORE M. MCKEE. *Charles Scribner's Sons, $2.50.*
DREAMS COME TRUE, *by* CHARLES R. BROWN. *The Macmillan Company, $1.50.*

GOOD sermons, timely, meaty, illuminative and inspiring are always in demand, whether from the pulpit or the press. Especially is this true when the preachers are masters of their art, experienced, gifted, ingenious, never stale or stereotyped. Here are three volumes which qualify for the inner circle of modern sermon material as at once challenging and refreshing.

In Quest of a Kingdom, by Leslie E. Weatherhead, is quite up to the author's high standard. This preacher's sermonic wares are always fresh, arresting, and often daringly original in his interpretation of familiar scriptures. "The Kingdom of Heaven," or "The Kingdom of God," is a New Testament phrase which admits of varied interpretations and is still shrouded in mystery for many. The author says in his preface that he has read all the literature on the Kingdom he could lay his hands on, and it is evident from a perusal of the twenty-three chapters that he has lived intimately with many books on the subject, and — most of all — the Bible.

"Man's relationship with God is wrong. This is the heart of the whole matter," Weatherhead declares. How to get right with the Eternal is the heart of the Good News in Jesus Christ. There is a sparkle to these sermons; they are likewise edifying and rich in germinal values. What preacher's sermonic appetite is not whetted by such topics as these: "The Sunshine of the Kingdom," "Expounding the Kingdom," "The Kingdom as a Joy," "Treachery to the Kingdom," "World Kingdoms and the Kingdom"?

Here is a preacher who enjoys leaving the beaten track and invading new fields of exposition. He knows too the value of a good illustration and uses incidents and anecdotes with discrimination. The style is direct, homely sometimes, human always, and down to this earth where we have to live even while we are reaching for the stars. The productivity of Weatherhead is amazing. This is his nineteenth book and may he live to write as many more before the day breaks and the shadows flee away.

Beyond the Night is Dr. McKee's fifth book. He is still in his forties and has made a shining mark for himself and his church in a city which someone has called "the graveyard of preachers." Very much alive is this preacher, and alert to his age and its problems. There is a noble maturity in his thinking, coupled with a high seriousness, yet albeit there is a wholesome optimism and the sound of trumpets in his preaching.

Victory over Disillusionment, Pride, Hatred, Circumstances, Indecision, Separation, Abandonment, Futility, Evil, and Death — such are the themes of this book; victory over all! Consider this episode chronicled by the author: A Dutch sea captain watched his Rotterdam home fall into ruins; lost his ship to Nazi bombers, and found his wife and child missing. In New York he dined with a minister who asked him to say grace before dinner. Certain words of the blessing brought reality very close: "O God," he prayed, "keep me from hating Hitler."

McKee's preaching comes to grips with life in the raw and in the dark. He possesses vigor and has no time to tinker with the trivial. These are ideal sermons for young preachers to read and meditate on as they prepare themselves before preparing their sermons. Here is good solid material, beautifully handled and with reverence always. In the chapter on "Victory over Death" here is a sentence to ponder: "Death is the greatest of initiations. Many are unready for it, but the man who says with Paul, 'To me to live is Christ,' while he never hurries the final adventure, is outward bound when it comes."

Dreams Come True (delightful title) is another collection of sermons by that grand old Maestro of the Ministry, Charles Reynolds Brown. Old? Surely not in spirit, thought or methods; rather, Dr. Brown is lustily youthful in outlook, sentiment, and industry. Rich in experience and a faith that has grown with the years, he is witty, wise, charming, and a hard-hitter when the occasion warrants. Here is a preacher who is never dull, prosaic, or platitudinous. I doubt whether Dr. Brown ever preached a poor sermon or went into the pulpit without adequate preparation. He simply isn't built that way.

This is a thin volume, physically, but not in content. There are twelve chapters and among the titles these: "The Ladder which Reached to the Sky," "The Handwriting on the Wall," "Say 'Yes,' " "Living Foursquare," "The Demand for Moral Courage," "First Things, First." Dr. Brown shies away from the obvious like a skittish horse. He is not afraid of a humorous thrust, not even the robust variety. On this premier preacher there rests a double portion of the spirit of sublimated common sense. Being a poet and a painter as well, the Doctor occasionally leaves the earth for a sojourn in the skies, but he never fails to make a happy landing. If there is a slight mixing of metaphors here, and I think there is, I am not disposed to untangle them. There are worse things than mixed metaphors — "mixed marriages," for instance.

Here in these three volumes by three beloved Comrades of The High Calling, we have a veritable arsenal of homiletics. As one reads them, he feels like saying (at any rate I do) "Praise the Lord, and pass *this* ammunition."

EDGAR DEWITT JONES

WORSHIP BRINGING UNITY TO LIFE

THE ALTAR AND THE WORLD, *by* BERNARD IDDINGS BELL. *Harper & Brothers, $1.25.*

WORSHIP AND THE COMMON LIFE, *by* ERIC HAYMAN. *Cambridge University Press, $2.50.*

THESE two books about worship are similar in very important respects in spite of the fact that the author of one, Bernard Iddings Bell, is a belligerent Anglo-Catholic, and the author of the other, Eric Hayman, an English Quaker. Dr. Bell's book is a running commentary on the Anglican Communion service and Mr. Hayman's is an exposition of the meaning of the worship of the Friends. Both writers begin with the fact that Christian worship is alien to the common life of men and seek through their probing into the meaning of worship to find a way in which it can once more bring unity into our life. Both writers accept in an unqualified way the Thomist criticism of secularism. They see only apostasy in the post-Renaissance world. They do not realize that the church itself has learned precious lessons in regard to tolerance, intellectual integrity, democracy, social justice from the very secular movements which they condemn. They are alike even in such specific matters as their attitude toward the war. Dr. Bell is not a Quaker pacifist but he obviously sees nothing of moral significance in the world-wide resistance to Axis domination which is at least one important strand in this war. He goes much farther than Hayman when he speaks of war as a "subhuman struggle of nations for booty." In these ways both books overstate the case against modernity: perhaps it would be more correct to say that they lack Christian humility as they make their Christian case against the world. That case is very strong but it would be more persuasive if the admission were made that the Christian Church greatly needed the kind of criticism and prodding that have come with scientific Humanism and the radical movements.

Dr. Bell's book is the simpler and the more beautiful. He writes with the eloquence of the great preacher that he is. Though he is an Anglo-Catholic I find nothing in this volume that, as a Protestant, I must reject so far as his treatment of the liturgy is concerned. In fact he has done much to increase my appreciation of the Anglican liturgy and to make me wish that my own church had at its center an act of worship that was as universal and as full of meaning. He writes as a social radical who is disillusioned about all tendencies toward social change. For example he says that "government has always been, and is, a cruel and monstrous necessity." There is an exaggerated spirituality in his thought that makes him write: "It is not freedom from *want* we need for world deliverance from battle; it is freedom from *wanting*, freedom from unnecessary appetite." That last clause may make the statement

literally true but the words carry an emphasis which comes from too indiscriminate a disgust with the economic struggle.

Worship and the Common Life is more of an academic analysis. Mr. Hayman deals with what he calls "the Quaker equivalent of 'liturgy.' " He sees the Quaker fellowship endangered by those within it who are interested chiefly in social service and by those within it who are attracted by a heresy which he connects with America, a heresy which he identifies with the name of Gerald Heard. In both cases Quakerism as a Christian movement is diluted. There are five stages in Quaker worship which he speaks of as *preparation, offering, intercession, consecration,* and *communion.* How each of these stages is related to what takes place in the Quaker meeting is not made clear and Mr. Hayman would probably admit that it would be difficult for the average Christian believer to experience these elements of worship without those external helps that the Quaker meeting lacks. He does admit that the external forms of sacramental worship will always be the more usual way for Christians to worship.

The author devotes his last chapter to a discussion of the relationship between the Quakers and the ecumenical movement. Everything in the book depends upon the conviction that the Quakers are a part of the ecumenical church. He is both understanding and pained as he watches other branches of the church try – without fully succeeding – to make a place for the Quakers in spite of their rejection of baptism and the Lord's Supper. He does not in any sense criticize nor does he seek to change those branches of the church which stress the sacraments, but he believes that the Quakers have a permanent testimony "to the 'non-necessity' of the outward elements and outward rites used by the church at large." In this I believe that he is right. An ecumenical church that includes the Quakers within its fellowship, as a kind of order, can retain its sacraments as its normal practice, but it will be less tempted to absolutize the form of them or to develop in connection with them a stifling clericalism which is the standing danger in a sacramental church.

JOHN C. BENNETT

PAPERS PREPARED BY MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN THEOLOGICAL COMMITTEE

THE BAPTIST CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH

By W. O. CARVER

THE Questionnaire which defines the structure of this paper is cast in vocabulary not in common use among Baptists; and it implies idea which Baptists characteristically and historically do not accept. Its approach to the concept of the Church is in conflict with that approach which accounts for the rise and growth of the Baptist denomination in the modern history of Christianity. Specifically the apparent connotation of the substantive term of the Questionnaire, Church, while rather ambiguous, indicates clearly the point at which Baptists differ from their Protestant brethren, and from the Roman and Orthodox Churches, the difference on which they justify their separate existence within the Christian following and on which rests their conviction of duty to maintain their witness to their brethren and to mankind.

In answering the questions proposed a Baptist must use utmost care that his answers may have the same meaning for non-Baptists that they have for Baptists. The vocabularies of the different member groups of the Baptist fellowship, within let us say the Baptist World Alliance, will show variations but there is essential agreement among them all concerning the central and basic beliefs and practices. No Southern Baptist speaks of "the Southern Baptist Church," although "the Baptist Church" did occur somewhat freely among all Baptists until a hundred years ago and was used by Southern Baptists upon occasion up to fifty years ago, as it continues rather frequent in the Baptist vocabulary elsewhere.

Baptists (especially Southern Baptists) usually do not use the term "Church" to signify organized Christianity as a whole, although this usage may be increasing; and many of them are not too familiar with its use to designate the entire body of spiritual followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. In general we all recognize three proper uses of the word "Church" and think all other uses more or less misleading and dangerous for the true understanding of "our most holy faith." These uses are:

(1) The whole number of spiritual, regenerate believers, constituting "the Body of Christ" in this world, expounded particularly in Ephesians. This Church, for Baptists, is not, and cannot be, ecclesiastically organized and it has no local seat nor any administrative human head or headship.

(2) The organized church, the functioning body of Christian believers, which should always be limited to a community in which convenient assembling and functioning are possible. It is a democratic body under the recognized authority and headship of its Lord and Saviour.

(3) The abstract, generic use of the term, as the church, the school, the state, the court, etc.

It will thus be seen that the organized church as an institution is not for Baptists primary but secondary, functional and instrumental. It was intended to be, and exists as, the functioning agency of the Kingdom of God on earth and of its gospel. Ideally it should concretely and socially embody the universal spiritual Church as the Body of Christ in each community. It is the declarative agency of that power but has no direct saving authority or power. It proclaims salvation and offers it to man in the name of the Redeemer, it does not definitively administer or withhold salvation. It has no vicarious mediatorial function, but is committed to the proclamation of the complete, exclusive priesthood and sacrifice of Jesus Christ as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. Baptists thus find no place in, and no place for, any hierarchy and no saving value in any sacrament. The ministry is functional rather than organic. There is no basic distinction of clergy and laity. We do not use the term "clergy" nor have "orders" in the ministry. We provide pastors ("elders," including teachers and administrators) and deacons in each congregation under the lead of the Holy Spirit; and set them apart for these functions by prayer and quite generally by the laying on of hands. Each church is under obligation to provide for itself such other serving functions as may be required (1 Corinthians 12). We recognize the general ministry of apostles (missionaries), prophets and evangelists (as in Ephesians 4:11) who function in the extension of the gospel beyond local churches, while pastor-teachers lead in the growth and work of the organized church.

In the light of these basic ideas the answers to the Questionnaire are given and are to be understood. Where the universal, spiritual Body is intended the word is written in this paper with capital initial C, *Church;* for the organized body with the small *c, church*. The section numerals parallel those in the Questionnaire.

I

Christ "founded" the Church (1) in the sense that by the spiritual changes which he wrought in those whom he accepted as his followers they became for him a continuous body through whom he would express and carry forward his redeeming work, and thereby would construct what Paul calls "a new humanity" (see 2 Corinthians 5:11–6:1; Ephesians 2:11–22, etc.); (2) in the sense that he prepared a limited group to constitute the first organic

unit of that series of churches through which the work of the gospel and the promotion of the Kingdom of God would be carried forward in his name. These men he probably did not formally organize into a church; but under the leadership of the Holy Spirit after his ascension they gradually developed their limited organization through which to discharge their functions; and as their work prospered similar churches were brought about in each community where the gospel took root.

II

Baptists consider that their present form of church organization in principle, as in purpose, reproduces essentially the New Testament doctrine and practice. Each such church definitely undertakes to do this and believes that it measurably does represent on the organizational side and in its spiritual purpose the mind of Christ and the way of the first Christians.

The Baptist position is not based on belief that literal following of New Testament practice is necessary, but on the conviction that essential Christian experiences and purposes require this type of institution and practice. We can see that the New Testament yields some basis for the claims of each of the three types of church organization. Among these the congregational type seems to us not only to be the characteristic and clearly the general form, but also to be the form which embodies the central and essential concepts of the Christian faith.

In the early churches all believers in a given city and its dependent communities were united in a single organizational unit with as many places of worship and work as wisdom indicated; and with a plurality of "elders" in each such church. Modern Baptists do not in practice follow exactly this example, but rather aim at the complete autonomy and independence of each worshipping and functional group; seeking co-operation among these units in associations, conventions, or councils. Baptists have no "church courts" and no superior organization that has any authority or control over the "local church" except as advisory and as an agency for voluntary co-operation.

For purposes of fellowship and of co-operation in many lines of work Baptists unite, primarily as individuals but also as churches, in territorial groupings designated "associations" or "conventions." Like the churches each of these combinations is autonomous. They are in no proper sense ecclesiastical bodies but are prudential and practical. In larger combinations we have the Northern and Southern Baptist Conventions and two National Conventions of Negro Baptists and still other smaller conventions for one or another reason maintaining distinct groupings. In other countries the Baptists usually combine similarly in "councils" or, especially when they have derived from American missionary activity, they use the name and methods of the convention.

The Baptist World Alliance is a voluntary autonomous fellowship of Baptists of all countries. It is for fellowship, for mutual encouragement and counsel, and to cultivate unity of experiences, sentiment, conviction and belief, and practice throughout the world.

In all these general bodies the complete autonomy and independence of the local body are jealously preserved.

III

"As a fellowship" Baptists believe that the Church is entered by the experience of regeneration wrought by the Holy Spirit in connection with repentance and faith on the part of each believer. The Church is thus "a fellowship of saints to which only saints are admitted," but this admission is exclusively the function of the Holy Spirit. It includes all who have had this experience, without any reference to the particular "communion" with which they are identified. It does not strictly and actually include "all who name Christ's name," for some of these may be mistaken about their experience and some may have inadequate experiences or even impure motives in claiming that name. In a general way, most Baptists would agree that this Church includes the saints in heaven, which would mean also the saints — by no means all the people — of the Old Covenant. Most Baptists believe that none are ever eliminated from the membership of this Church, once they have been brought into it through the believing experience. All believers are under primary obligation to take membership in an organized church.

Into the organized church, Baptists receive those, only, who have made a credible profession of faith in Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour. These are admitted by vote of the church in each individual case. After this vote and by its authority they are baptized (immersed according to the pattern set out in Romans 6:1–4, etc.) and thereby come into full fellowship and membership. If they prove unworthy, or if they express a determined wish not to continue in this fellowship, "the hand of fellowship is withdrawn from them," also by vote of the body. It is our ideal that the organized church should include in its membership all believers in its community and thus be identical locally with the Church. Since the Church is not organized as a whole these churches are not in our way of speaking "branches of the Church." This term "branches" is not in the Baptist ecclesiological vocabulary.

If a member of a Baptist church unites with a church of another denomination "the hand of church fellowship is withdrawn," not "the hand of Christian fellowship" as in the case of those excluded for unworthy life. If a member in good standing reports to his church a desire to join a church of another denomination and requests it, a letter of commendation will usually be given to the receiving church, but "the hand of church fellowship" will

still "be withdrawn," for the reason assigned. The record will show the facts.

IV

Our denomination stresses the conception of the church as "a voluntary society for carrying on the work of Christ," but we would insist that it is more than a "merely voluntary" society for it is a creation of the Holy Spirit and locally the body of Christ. It is limited to those who have experienced the grace of salvation and who seek the fellowship under the constraint of the Spirit of Jesus.

We exalt the ideal that the church is "a fellowship ruled by the Spirit of Christ." Each church has a covenant which begins by recognizing that the grace of God has brought us into salvation and into this fellowship. It goes on to commit the members to mutual care, to faithful living and to the maintenance and extension of the pure gospel.

As a rule we do not think of the church as a local "continuation of the Incarnation." Nor do most Baptists conceive of the Church (the entire body of believers) as the "continuation of the Incarnation." But it is the conviction of an increasing number of us that this is a thoroughly scriptural and highly important way of conceiving of the Church. Those of us who accept and emphasize this thought believe ourselves to be in important accord with the conception of Paul in Ephesians and Colossians and with the less clear and developed idea of the Book of Hebrews; and that this conception derives from Jesus Christ himself.

For both the Church and the churches, the guide is the New Testament, interpreted and applied by the members under the leadership of the Holy Spirit, who, since Pentecost, incorporates himself in the Church and in the churches in order thereby to realize on earth the continuing life of the Christ.

V

The "most essential feature of the message of the Church" (i.e., of all Christians and of the churches) is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning man in his need and in his possibilities by redemption; concerning the Kingdom of God and the glory of God in that Kingdom. The most essential thing in its mission is to proclaim the Kingdom of God as his purpose and demand, and the grace of God for redemption, sanctification, and righteousness in individual men and thereby in the community of mankind. All of this centers in the affirmation that "God was [and is] in Christ reconciling the world unto himself . . . and having committed unto us the word of the reconciliation." The mission of the Church, as of the churches, is thus to win men through the gospel and to develop them in the understanding and

in the realization of the full meaning of their "high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

VI

(1) In relation to the world the Church (churches) is in it but not of it. By, and in the measure of, the Holy Spirit's use of it, the business of a church is "to convict the world with reference to sin, with reference to righteousness, and with reference to judgment." Christians individually and in church groups should always come to the world as the prophets of God, declaring by their very presence and in their message the judgment, the mercy, and the truth of God. Thus they should be "the light of the world" and "the salt of the earth."

(2) In relation to the state, the Church (its members and the churches) should recognize the state as a necessary and divinely sanctioned institution for public order and welfare. We believe in the separate functions and the absolute separation and independence each from the other, of the church and the state as institutions. In civil matters the state has a sphere of proper authority which the individual and the church should respect and honor. In the realm of religion the individual and the church must claim freedom from interference by the state. The state must neither control nor support the church; nor hinder its free functioning in the realm of the spiritual life and religious relations; the church must give ethical and moral support to the state, contributing to good citizenship but not seeking or accepting control over the state. The churches, individually and in proper combined expression, by challenge and in judgment, should serve as ethical conscience for the common life of society, including the state.

(3) It is the business of the Church (Christians and churches) continuously to proclaim the Kingdom of God; to exhibit in their individual and their corporate lives the principles and the power of that Kingdom; to function continuously as the agency of the Kingdom in its interpretation and in the expanding of its gospel to all people. It should proclaim and exhibit and urge the righteousness, the justice and the love of God in all human relations, individual and corporate.

VII

We believe that "the continuity of the true Church of Christ" is maintained by the continuous working of the Holy Spirit through the agencies of the gospel in the winning and developing of believers in the Lord Jesus Christ who are committed to his lordship. The continuity of the true churches of Jesus Christ is, we believe, maintained by the continued grouping of believers after the manner and in the spirit of Christianity as revealed in the New Testament. With exceptions of minority groups at times, Bap-

tists are not concerned about ecclesiastical institutional continuity, through "apostolic succession," "orders of the ministry," "right administration o the sacraments," or any other physical or tactual means. In the technical ecclesiastical sense we reject all sacramentalism, while we understand tha any material substance or institutions and all nature may have a spiritually sacramental value for the believer.

Our churches believe that they are maintaining this essential "continuity of the true Church of Christ" by faithfully preaching the gospel and by loyally cherishing and administering the two ordinances which symbolize the essential facts and experiences of the gospel. By baptism Jesus has given us a sacred symbol which sets forth the ground of redemption through hi death, burial, and resurrection; the experience of salvation as death to sin and resurrection to newness of life; the hope of the consummation in the final "resurrection" to the fullness of life eternal. The cornerstone of the Christian movement was laid in the opened grave: baptism continuously advertises this essential fact. In the symbols of bread and wine the Lord ha appointed that his followers shall keep before themselves our dependence on him for sustaining our spiritual life; the fact of communion of the saint as one body in him; and by this ordinance "proclaim the Lord's death till h come." In this sense these physical symbols become sacred, "sacramental."

We have "Confessions of Faith" rather than "Creeds." These serve as a basis of unity, as a public statement of our understanding of our common Christianity, as a guide in defining and developing experience and under standing. They are not authoritative and there is no authoritative form o such confession.

VIII

In the last hundred years there has been marked growth in the belief and practice of Christian missions among Baptists; extensive increase in ou conviction of the importance of Christian education and of provision fo achieving it; a corresponding and very great increase of interest in th training of its ministers and workers and membership; a gradually growin sense of "fellowship of all the saints," and a distinct sharing in the more gen erous and appreciative attitude among all denominations toward Christian of other denominations.

There has always been variation in Baptist practice with reference to re ceiving members who had been immersed under other than Baptist aus pices, as profession of saving faith in Jesus Christ, some accepting them i convinced that the baptism was with true gospel intent, others rejecting al such as "alien immersions." There has been less difference in practice wit reference to so-called "close communion." Holding that immersion of a be liever alone is true baptism, and agreeing with almost all "churches" tha

baptism rightly precedes the Lord's Supper, the large majority of Baptist churches a hundred years ago practiced "close communion." English Baptists more often allowed "open communion."

During the century the rejection of "alien immersions" has tended to diminish; and there has been an appreciable growth in "open communion." There are two principal American "Confessions of Faith." The older one (used but not formally approved and printed until 1742) closely follows the English Confession of 1689, which in turn differed from the Westminster only as the Baptist conviction required. It approaches the organized churches and the ordinances from the standpoint of the universal, spiritual Church, "which . . . may be called invisible." It takes explicit account of the fact that all who have been called and have responded to the grace of God for salvation are "visible saints" and under obligation to take membership in an organized church. It is not wholly clear as to the recognition of churches that hold to erroneous ideas and practices, as Baptists believed. The other (1832) defines them as "church ordinances" and inculcates strictness in their observance. It ignores the universal Church. Except in isolated cases these differences are not tests of fellowship among Baptists, each church being free to determine its course. No Baptist church accepts other "modes" "instead of immersion (baptism)." Some churches, especially in England, receive persons so "baptized" as "without baptism." The small number of churches in which such persons are accorded "full membership" is probably increasing somewhat. The status of such members varies among the churches.

There has been definite growth in the co-operation of the churches in associations, conventions, and other forms of common endeavor, thus growth in "eliciting, combining and directing the energies of the Baptist people" in the meaning and work of the gospel. In this way there has been marked progress in denominational integration, consciousness of oneness and unifying fellowship. It is to be feared that in this growth there has been also a tendency to subordinate and obscure the spiritual and spontaneous nature of our religion in the direction of institutionalism, formalism, and externalism. The dangers of secularism always beset spiritual values.

IX

The distinctive contribution of Baptists to "the Church Universal" is to be found in their insistence on the individual soul in relation to God, without human mediation of parent, priest, church, or sacrament, and in the conception of the entire ecclesiastical autonomy of the church. Their root belief and life principle have been and remain individualism and voluntarism in religious experience, relation and responsibility. They believe that the entire gospel and program of God in human history are based on the

conception that God intends the individual to be the unit in his relation to mankind and deals immediately with every soul. Out of this basic principle grows their insistence on voluntariness in ecclesiastical relation, without external restraint or compulsion, or interference with the individual or the church. Out of this understanding grows also the distinct Baptist contribution, as yet very far from being generally accepted in Christendom, of the entire separation of church and state, complete independence of the two institutions, with mutual helpfulness between the two in the social order (see under VI). Baptists would not claim to be the exclusive representatives among denominations of any of these principles. They are convinced that the combination and consistency with which they have held them, and their reasons for holding them, constitute a distinctive contribution to fellow Christians and to Christianity in its history.

From some of our brethren in other "communions" many Baptists could learn a more rounded and effective emphasis on worship, more orderliness and beauty in the physical aspects of our corporate life; a fuller ministry to leaders in the world's life, providing always that we can give this ministry without neglect of "the common people" to whom it has been our glory to minister the gospel of salvation. Most of the churches of most of the "Churches," including our own, are class-conscious and function too largely as class churches. All of us can help one another in this respect. We Baptists could acquire more appreciation of the historic continuity of the Christian faith and life and recover the sense of community of all believers which we largely lost in the centuries of our struggles for freedom under the persecutions inflicted by Catholics and Protestants, and from which our people still suffer in some countries.

THE CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH HELD BY THE BRETHREN

By WARREN W. SLABAUGH

I

CHRIST founded the Church in the sense that he created a fellowship of men and women who had attached themselves to him in faith, and this fellowship was perpetuated in the historical Church. He commissioned them to carry on the work of proclaiming the gospel, and he empowered

them for the task by giving them the Spirit. Though he thought of the Church as primarily a spiritual organism, he was not unmindful of certain outward aspects of its corporate life. In the appointment of the Twelve he contemplated activities beyond his lifetime and certain of his instructions had to do with this later period. He also instituted two sacraments.

II

The Brethren do not hold that one form of organization is right to the exclusion of all others, but they have always insisted that their own organization be simple, attempting to preserve the spirit of humility and service which marked the leadership of the Early Church. The only permanent officials are elders, ministers, and deacons, who are elected by the several congregations, and are inducted into office by the laying on of hands. In the case of elders, this ceremony is called ordination. The polity of the Brethren tends to the Congregational type. There is a general conference, but its decisions are regarded as advisory rather than mandatory.

III

The Church is the fellowship of the "Saints," attached by bonds of devotion to their Lord and to one another. This fellowship exhibits a spirit of mutual respect which abolishes distinctions based on wealth, class or cultural advantage. Membership in the Church is based on the individual's faith in Christ as Saviour and Lord, repentance from sin, and baptism, and is marked by devotion, purity of life and service. In a broader sense, the Church includes the people of the Old Covenant who have fulfilled its conditions. The Church looks forward to its fulfilment in "heaven"; the "invisible Church" includes all who "die in the Lord." The Church as a close-knit community has authority on earth from Christ to admit to its membership and to exclude from it.

IV

Christ is the Lord of the Church, in that he founded it and is the source of its life. The attitude of the Church to him is one of faith and obedience; faith in him as Lord and Saviour, obedience to his commandments. The Church is more than a "voluntary association"; although men enter the Church by their own choice, the impulse comes through the Holy Spirit, and thus, the whole process is a work of grace. The term "continuation of the incarnation" is not a familiar phrase among the Brethren. Certainly the Church carries on the work of evangelism which Christ began, but it is only the channel of his redemptive power, and the authority does not pass to the Church but remains in him.

V

The message of the Church is Jesus Christ, the perfect revelation of God to the world. It is a gospel of God's redemptive grace, offered to all men in their sins, an offer of pardon and of acceptance into the family of God. The mission of the Church is to proclaim this message, a message of judgment and of salvation. The spoken message is to be reinforced by the influence of lives of purity and service, promoting the Kingdom of God in every area of human life with all the spiritual resources of the Church.

VI

(a) There is a line of cleavage between the Church and the world, based on the spiritual nature and higher ethics of the Church. Yet the world is the object of the concern of the Church. Christ commands his Church to make disciples of all the nations; his followers have caught something of his compassion for the lost, and desire to share their blessings with those who are outside. Though the Church is not of the world, it is ever seeking to win the world.

(b) In the matter of Church and state, the Brethren have regarded the state as "having been ordained of God." The state has its separate function, to set up and enforce regulations in the economic, political, and material spheres of life. On the other hand, due to its insistence on separation of Church and state, and partly due to the influence of its pietistic background, the Brethren Church has, in the past, stood against participation in political matters, even advising against voting. As a pacifist Church throughout its history it has had to resist the demands of the state to support war. But it attempts to create character in its membership which makes for good citizenship and thus promotes in society these agencies which conserve human values.

(c) With regard to the Church and the Kingdom of God, the Church is both the end and the means. The spiritual values of the Kingdom begin to be realized in the Church, and in turn the Church is the means toward the realization of the Kingdom in its ultimate fulness.

VII

The Brethren believe that the maintenance of the "continuity of the true Church of Christ" is a spiritual process. Though they cannot claim "apostolic succession" as understood by the Roman Church, they do claim that they are in the line of the successors of the apostles by preaching the Word and administering the sacraments. But this succession is not through the ordained ministry but through the brotherhood of believers in Christ, of which the ministers are the servants.

VIII

The Brethren have turned from the isolation which marked their history after the Revolutionary War to a larger participation in community life, and to more cordial relations with other denominations. They have revived an earlier interest in education, both secular and theological. The membership is no longer wholly rural. The Church is moving toward a paid and educated ministry. The Brethren stress less than formerly the control of the individual conscience by the Church, attempting to secure character and growth through fostering a spirit of devotion to Christ and the Church. They have implemented their peace testimony in the present war by taking an active part in the promotion of Civilian Public Service for all conscientious objectors.

IX

The Brethren have never claimed to possess Christian virtues above their fellow denominations. They share a common faith in Christ, a common responsibility to preach the gospel, a common hope. While attempting to hold to a balanced program, there are certain special emphases which they hold as a heritage. They insist that trine immersion on confession of faith is in accord with the practice of the Early Church. They are a people of the Book, interpreting it rather literally. This is shown in their refusal to take the oath, and in their upholding of pacifism. They practice footwashing and the anointing of the sick with oil. They have always stressed the importance of wholesome family life and have opposed divorce except on scriptural grounds. They have been marked for their close community spirit and their emphasis on the simple, yet withal the good life.

We of the Brethren Church are coming to feel the need of a more cooperative fellowship with other communions. We need to give more attention to worship, and to cultivate the esthetic in our corporate church life. We have neglected the formulation of our doctrinal beliefs and would do well to clarify our thinking and teaching in the field of Christian doctrine.

A QUAKER VIEW OF THE CHURCH

By HENRY J. CADBURY

A QUAKER confronted with a series of questions about "the Church" and "your Church" has no official pronouncements to fall back on, nor even the practice of definitive formulation of doctrine, least of all a formal

doctrine of the Church. Much of the terminology used in the questionnaire is, unless it happens also to be Biblical, alien to Friends' usage. If they apply borrowed ecclesiological phrases to their own way, Friends tend to spiritualize or universalize them. When they speak of all life as sacramental, or all believers as a priesthood they are deliberately rejecting terms of limited application in other Churches by a levelling up process. They tend to define as *de facto* what others would treat as *de regula*. The Church and its members and its characteristics are to be described from experience, not from a doctrine or constitution. The contribution of Quakerism to any doctrine of the Church will rest on its experience and not on any statement formal or informal of its belief and practice.

I

There is little reason to suppose that Friends have any distinctive answer to the question, "In what sense did Christ 'found' the Church?" They accept the New Testament narrative of the early Christian movement. In so far as they deal with it critically they regard the resultant development as a natural sequel to the original career of Jesus under the influence of God's spirit rather than as something planned by Jesus with prescribed patterns. The Church and Churches exist today subject to the same historical and contemporary influences. Friends believe that guidance in the framing, altering, and moulding of the constitution of a true Church may still come from the divine source (whether that is called God, Christ, or Spirit). They understand the rock mentioned in Matthew 16:18 not as Peter, but as revelation not from flesh and blood. They accept both the Pauline phrases for Christ, the foundation (I Corinthians 3:11) and the head of the Church (Ephesians 5:23).

II

The Society of Friends does not regard its organization as in exact correspondence with the New Testament's teaching and practice respecting the Church. It knows that its own organization originated in the seventeenth century to meet the needs of the Quaker movement. The other Christian bodies of that time did not appear to have such a copy of primitive Christian organization as to commend itself to Friends, who, on the contrary, reacted against much of the current church theory and practice. Friends pointed out that the New Testament Church had not these objectionable features. Their own independent and evolving practices sometimes unconsciously paralleled those of primitive Christianity, as critical studies of the latter now disclose. There was also conscious imitation. Like their rivals the

Friends claimed to represent primitive Christianity revived, but in this claim they were concerned to foster religious experience and moral practice as well as to protest against the lapses from primitive practice which most other Churches seemed to share with Catholicism ("Popery"). These lapses included such things as tithes, paid clergy, saints' days, stereotyped forms and ceremonies, and religious persecution; but Friends were prepared to find true Christians inside as well as outside such Churches. When modern Biblical research raised doubt about the formalism of the early churches, about the regularity and uniformity of their organization, about the meaning of baptism and the Supper, about the words spoken in connection with them and their intention in the mind of Jesus, many Friends discovered, as Robert Barclay discovered much earlier, what good precedents the New Testament afforded for their own indifference to form and creed.

III

The Society of Friends believes in the Church universal but does not try precisely to define it, still less to identify its characteristics and the conditions of entrance into it with those that prevail in the Society of Friends. As far as the latter is concerned, membership is extended to those who apply to a local meeting and who are accepted. Until recently the children of Friends were regarded as Friends from birth. Nowadays in some cases they are Associate Members until spiritually ready for full membership. For nearly its whole first century the Society of Friends had no exact limits of membership. Those who adhered to the movement were known to do so and were regarded as members. But they were not listed or counted. If they flagrantly defied the Quaker standards of conduct they were explicitly disowned. If they removed to another area their meeting notified the other local meeting that they were in good standing. This is still the practice. An applicant for membership today is accepted by a local meeting after some appropriate committee has discussed with him his understanding of Quakerism and has otherwise satisfied itself that it should recommend him. Obviously no norm prevails alike in all meetings, but genuine striving rather than saintly achievement is the condition expected of applicants.

As a general Quaker definition of the characteristics of the Church the following sentences from Robert Barclay's *Apology* (1676) are satisfactory:

> A particular Church of Christ signifies a certain number of persons gathered by God's Spirit . . . unto the belief of the true principles and doctrines of the Christian Faith, who, through their hearts being united by the same love and their understandings informed in the same truths, gather, meet and assemble together to wait upon God, to worship Him and to bear a joint testimony for the truth against error, suffering for the same.

It is the life of Christianity taking place in the heart that makes a Christian; and so it is a number of such being alive, joined together in the life of Christianity, that make a Church of Christ; and it is all those that are thus alive and quickened, considered together, that make the catholic Church of Christ.

Friends emphasize the relation to Christ more for individuals than for the group. They rarely indulge in expressions that would claim group unity with Christ in a mystical sense. Yet in proportion as Quakerism is free from human hierarchy or officialdom it can stress the leadership of Christ as "head of the Church." Its apparent ecclesiastical anarchism often includes with great individualism a deep theocratic unity. They make decisions not by counting votes but by finding a basis of agreement that excludes majority and minority. Since they generally have not applied the words "church" or "communion" specifically to their own Society, Friends have not been tempted to appropriate to themselves the somewhat intimate group relation to Christ that goes with them. Nor have they until recently been very conscious of belonging to any homogeneous and congenial larger Christendom so as to think much of the Catholic Church in such terms.

IV

The message and mission of the Church are largely identical with the message and mission of the Christian. But since the Church is the fellowship and company of Christians it represents Christians working and testifying collectively and mutually supporting, correcting, and helping each other. Provision for collective worship is a function of the Church that seems to many Friends very important; religious education is another. How far the Church as such should foster the less obviously religious joint undertakings of Christians is an open question. Friends have laid stress on the call to service as coming first to the individual. The Church may be said merely to recognize the call and to facilitate the service. This view does not tend to wholesale or high-powered promotion nor to bureaucracy. It does not agree with usual standards of efficiency and organization. For long the activities of Friends against slavery, war, intemperance, and mistreatment of criminals and insane, as well as their work in home and foreign missions and in religious and secular education, were without official sanction of the meetings. Members who felt "a concern" for these matters made their voluntary organization, sometimes in association with non-members, while the Church's function was regarded as the cultivating in its members of a sensitive conscience and an attitude of obedience to duty, out of which these outside activities would arise. In spite of its widespread support by all groups of Friends the American Friends Service Committee has operated as an independent, undelegated, and unofficial corporation.

V

Speaking again in terms of the individual rather than of the Church, the Christian is in the world but not of it. He sits loose to its conventions and customs. He proves what is good. He believes that in every man there is something of God and his loyalty is to that aspect in himself and in others. Friends are still criticized by leading theologians as perfectionists – the criticism that was made of George Fox. Not only the individual lives of mankind but their social order are matters of concern to any Christian society. Hence the state has a legitimate function and a Christian may engage in government, but Friends have been equally concerned to disobey, to counteract, or to supplement the government when they felt dissatisfied with its policies. Friends appreciate what a danger the state may be to religion, but they little think of the state as a rival to another organization or institution called the Church. They recall, as their classic contributions to this problem, the example of religious toleration in the Quaker-governed colonies of America, the effect of their persistent civil disobedience in correcting obnoxious legislation, their policy which combined justice to the Indian with total disarmament through seventy-five years in Pennsylvania, and other aspects of Penn's "holy experiment."

For Friends as for other groups the return to currency in religious speech of the phrase "Kingdom of God" is too recent to have acquired for the words any very clear or characteristic relation to the term Church.

VI

The Society of Friends would claim not to have continued the true Church of Christ but to have restored it after sixteen hundred years and to have done so more fully than the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent, and Anabaptist groups. For example, concerning the outward sacraments their latest discipline (1944) says:

> Friends do not feel the need of symbols when the realities symbolized are achieved [in the experience of worship]. They do not find that Jesus commanded that the "sacraments" be observed as perpetual ordinances of his Church. They have furthermore been impressed by the endless controversies and divisions over them and by the historical variations in practice. The baptism, which they consider to be essential, is that of the Holy Spirit; the communion which they most earnestly desire is participation with Christ, the Bread of Life, and the spiritual apprehension of God as the source of life and power.

Many Friends are not concerned about their continuity with the past, just because they are concerned about their adequacy to meet what the present and the future demand of real Christians.

VII

The adjustment of Quakerism to current thought has been made with relative ease. The "higher criticism" of the Bible was less disturbing to a group that had not enthroned the letter above the spirit, or the Book above the Light within. Modern psychology was congenial to their long-standing emphasis upon inward experience. The modern attempt to apply religion to social institutions was anticipated by their early sensitiveness to social ills. Their religious pacifism finds adequate new sanctions in the social ethics of our less scriptural and sentimental age, even when the bulk of Christendom acquiesces in war-making. The modern movement for Foreign Missions, dating in American Protestantism generally from about 1800–1810, was preceded 150 years before by the intense expansive wave of Quaker preaching in five continents. At that time their belief that there was something of God in every man, even Turks, Moors, and Negroes, differentiated them from contemporaries who preached to none outside of Christendom (except to the Jews and to the American Indians identified with the lost tribes of Israel).

Among the many changes of the last century have been their emergence out of quietism, their relaxing of some external peculiarities, their intermingling with other Churches, and their decreased sense of self-defense owing to the more widespread understanding of Quakerism and to the unconscious assimilation of other groups to its viewpoint. The revival movement in America three generations ago introduced into certain areas of Quakerism the usual pattern of Protestant worship with a prearranged program, a paid pastor and often with a heavier emphasis on the evangelical aspects of Quakerism's multiple theological inheritance. Conversely, in more recent times the distinctive features of Quakerism have been increasingly appreciated, accepted, and interpreted with growing self-consciousness.

VIII

Quakerism differs at so many points from the usual run of Protestant emphasis and practice that it offers an inconvenient challenge to much that is taken for granted. In any ecumenical movement that is willing to include it and that it is willing to join, the Society of Friends has a "nuisance value" quite out of proportion to its size. To whatever common denominator the largest denominations can agree on, Quakerism would often provide an exception of theory and practice, "lest one good custom should corrupt the world." In many matters ecclesiastical the Friends represent one extreme, and may be supposed to render to the total picture whatever service extremists do render in the interplay of variations in social institutions. Among

these extremes are individualism and creedlessness to the verge of vagueness and unhomogeneity, notable equalitarianism as between men and women in the service of the church or as between clergy and laity, simplicity of worship, etc. Of their peculiarities one will seem significant in one situation and one in another.

The same may be said about the features of Quakerism that might be mentioned as defects in their heritage. The contributions to religion derivable from art and music were long neglected among them. Ecumenicity, both as a word and as a feeling, is as novel to Friends as to many other Christians. (In the seventeenth century "ecumenical" meant domestic.) Theoretically their doctrine is inclusive in its outreach, but due to persecution and studied peculiarity they became provincial and almost exclusive, a delightfully intimate small fellowship. "Historic ingratitude" has been attributed to them as a besetting sin by an Anglican bishop who found them hopelessly indifferent to proper Christian traditions. An increasing acquaintance with church history and their own history is to be desired for the perspective it gives. Greater fidelity to the spirit of their best tradition and a more imaginative readiness for the newer kinds of non-conformity, suffering, and sacrifice that are needed in our secularized sub-Christian society constitute other desiderata.

THE ANGLICAN CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH

By LEICESTER C. LEWIS

I

IN many theological discussions, the presuppositions are often more significant than the points excitedly discussed. In no case is this more true than in the discussion of Anglican doctrine. For that reason I would point out at the start several presuppositions on the part of Anglicans which are operative in any doctrinal discussion.

In the first place, the American Episcopal Church is a part of the World-wide Anglican Communion whose center is at Canterbury. Each of the numerous national Churches which are in communion with each other by virtue of their communion with Canterbury has, of course, independence of action and in certain minor ways its own peculiar slant or emphasis in doctrine and practice. Nevertheless, all members of these varied Churches

feel strongly their connection with Canterbury and therefore they hardly ever decide any matter of great importance without reference to the Mother Church. Even here in America, with our noted enthusiasm for independence, our House of Bishops has repeatedly refused to decide matters until they had been referred to Canterbury. Thus, the doctrine of the Church as held in the Episcopal Church in this country is in its fundamentals the same as that of the entire Anglican Communion throughout the world.

A second presupposition is that which has been often expressed in the paradox that the Anglican Church has quite definite doctrinal standards just because it has no distinctive doctrines of its own. This is merely a verbal paradox, but it does approach an important truth. This truth is that the Anglican Church has repeatedly appealed in matters of doctrine to the teaching of the Undivided Church. By this Anglicans expressed the conviction that for the first thousand years of Christian history there was a substantial continuum of Christian doctrine. Both in the East and in the West a universality of agreed doctrine created a universality of standard life. After the eleventh century, quite evidently, differences become more marked between the Eastern and the Western expressions of Christianity. Nevertheless, even here a large body of Christian teaching remained intact. It is this general tradition of Christian teaching which the Anglican Church would make its own and it is in this sense that it has no distinctive teaching. Of course, the Anglican feels that in the above standard he actually has a very definite and distinctive body of doctrine.

A third presupposition which must never be discounted is that the Anglican Church, with its overwhelmingly Anglo-Saxon heritage and personnel, is less logical than other English-speaking groups in whom a German or a French theological strain has been historically directive. There are many Anglicans who would wish to see their Church more logical than she is, but it would be inaccurate to claim complete logical consistency for the Anglican Church as in truth she is.

II

Anglicans feel that the Church is today, and has been through the centuries from Pentecost, a visible society with institutionalized officers, regulations, and powers. It is this view of the Church as an historic institution, functioning with the normal rights and privileges of any institution, that seems to be the point of debate among many in their conception of the Church.

Anglicans feel that a society appeared in history as a result of the life and teaching of Christ. In so far as the New Testament reflects the life of this society, Anglicans find it a fellowship or Church, organized and functioning under the leadership of the Apostles and perpetuating their teaching, worship, and prayers.

We feel that there is no evidence whatsoever in the New Testament that anyone would be considered a Christian who was not a member of this visible society, the Church. Those who were to be saved were added to the Church, and over all its members the fellowship exercised definite and sometimes striking authority.

It is for this reason that among Anglicans the term Invisible Church seems quite meaningless. They do not see how the New Testament attitude of "telling it" to the Church could be rational if the Church were invisible and, equally, would they find it difficult to "hear" an invisible Church. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that for Anglicans the Church is the society of people, primarily here on earth. When Anglicans use the term Invisible Church they mean by it that larger part of the visible Church which has passed from this life to the life beyond.

Anglicans feel that historically the doctrine of the Invisible Church has generally been the expression of discouragement and frustration in efforts to reform the Church. With the failure of such efforts in regard to the Visible Church an escape was developed by the thought of an Invisible Church.

The Church is not coterminous with the Elect. There may be many good people who are not members of the Church, as unquestionably there are many bad people who are members of the Church. In order to avoid confusion sometimes engendered by the doctrine of the Church, it might be stated definitely that not all members of the Church are saved and, equally, that not all non-members of the Church are damned. These views are to Anglicans truisms and platitudes, but in view of many discussions it is perhaps safer to state them here once again.

It is probably in the historic view of the development of Christianity as a whole that Anglican thought differs most radically from that of much other post-Reformation thought. Anglicans do not believe that Christianity appeared once upon a time in the world in the person of Christ and then started in upon a long epoch of decline and degradation until the pure gospel was rediscovered in certain places in the sixteenth century. Quite to the contrary, Anglicans believe that the original Christian tradition was expanded and enriched in every succeeding century from the first. Of course, it is recognized that corruption came into the Church and worked great harm in certain centuries, even as it does today, but Anglicans feel that this in no way affects the continuity principle of the historic Church. To use the analogy of the human body, there is hardly a single moment in anyone's life when there is not some wearing away or germ of disease at work. This should certainly be corrected whenever possible, but the body itself continues functioning while life lasts.

It is for this reason that Anglicans are generally skeptical as to the value of many slogans currently bandied about in many religious circles. Such phrases as "Not a code but a life," "Not the Bible but its spirit," and many

other remarks such as these seem to Anglicans at best mere half-truths. In fact, it may be generally asserted that Anglicans have no very great fear of Christianity becoming too much institutionalized. We are convinced that in most parts of life progress from the barbarian to the civilized has been largely a creation of institutionalization and we feel that there is no good reason for denying the same truth in religion.

III

It is in the soil of this tradition, wider and longer than its own, that Anglicanism gets its start. It is firmly convinced on the evidence of history that Henry VIII did not found the English Church. In other words, members of the Anglican Church today feel that the commotions of the sixteenth century formed only an episode in the very much longer history of their Church. They feel that this Church of theirs goes back at least to the coming of St. Augustine in the year 597 and that there has been no vital organizational break from his time until today. It is, of course, possible that they are wrong in this conviction, but there can be no doubt that this is the conviction of the vast majority of Anglicans. It is this same truth which is expressed throughout the Prayer Book and especially in the services of Ordination. Never does the Anglican Church think of itself as a creation of the Reformation, but always as a reformed part of the much older Universal Church.

It is not plain that Anglicanism started out with any clear-cut blueprint of its program of development, but we do feel that in the Providence of God historical circumstances developed in such a manner that a distinct identity was given to the Anglican Church which separates it both from popular Protestantism on the one hand and the Roman Catholic Church on the other. This is a fact difficult for the American mind to understand, since the position and influence of the Eastern Orthodox Churches in the West have been almost entirely negligible. In the West, any group not in communion with Rome has automatically been termed Protestant and undoubtedly in this sense the Anglican Communion is definitely Protestant. On the other hand, in the Eastern section of Christendom a group would readily be understood as Catholic which, while it did not accept the Papacy, held on firmly to the older institutional structure.

Just prior to the Reformation the Anglican Church was one of the Western Churches which had accepted the steadily increasing overlordship of the Pope. It probably differed very little from any of the other Western Churches which accepted this overlordship. At the same time, it must be remembered that prior to the Council of Trent the rigid discipline and authoritative doctrinal definitions of the modern Roman Church were absent

and that the connection with the Papacy was largely informal, financial, and administrative.

Under King Henry VIII the jurisdiction of the Papacy in England was specifically repudiated and the supremacy of the Crown definitely accepted. Beyond this, however, it is important to remember that the creeds, scriptures, sacraments, ministry, and ceremonial remained unchanged. So much was this the case that it is very probable that a lay person at the end of the reign of Henry would have felt that little change had occurred in his religion from that which he had at the start of that reign.

Under Edward VI far-reaching liturgical changes were carried on, and after the Marian reaction were resumed under Queen Elizabeth. By the authorization of the Elizabethan Prayer Book, the restoration of the hierarchy under Archbishop Parker and the Articles of Religion, the general Anglican position was established.

At the end of Elizabeth's long reign in 1603 the identity of the Anglican Church as distinct from Protestant Nonconformists and from a Roman Catholic Church was fairly clearly recognized. The various attacks upon the established Church under Charles I and Charles II testify to this recognition.

Finally, the Restoration put its seal upon this structure and created that Anglican position which has lasted substantially unchanged to the present day.

IV

It is frequently asked what it is that creates the essential unity of action among Anglicans. Undoubtedly, the use of the one Prayer Book by all Anglicans has helped largely to preserve and to express this unity. The fact that, no matter what may be the individual belief of the minister, the text of the service is the same for all and the standards of discipline are common to all, has, without doubt, tended to create a unity of outlook and of action. Beyond this, a minimum of ceremonial common to all and necessitated by the very use of the Prayer Book has also aided in this direction.

A third distinctive bond of unity among Anglicans has been the fact that while the official teaching and standards of the Church have been unquestionably on the Catholic side, the discipline which would logically flow from these standards has not, in fact, been practiced.

For instance, the Church clearly teaches that the priest has the power of absolution and the English Prayer Book has the definite form for auricular confession. Nevertheless, the practice of confession is by no means universal among Anglicans and non-users of this privilege have never been faulted by Anglican authority. Equally, the Communion Service teaches explicitly that the Eucharist is a sacrifice and that it is offered both for the living and

for the dead. Equally, however, there are many members of the Anglican Church who do not put this into practice. Even further, in the matter of ceremony, so far as rubrical and legal enactments are concerned, the rather elaborate ceremonial of the Eucharistic vestments is ordered. At the same time these commands were not in force from the time of Elizabeth to the middle of the nineteenth century.

This lack of logic would create an intolerable situation were it not for the fact that the Catholic system on most points is larger and wider than the corresponding Protestant position. This enables Anglicans who are attached to Protestantism to be content with the actual practice of large parts of their Communion, while at the same time it allows Catholic-minded Anglicans to have the fuller practice of the Catholic system, since they can always appeal to the official standards of their Church.

V

At least three different parties have emerged in the history of Anglicanism, and with various changes these parties have remained in influence down to the present day. The oldest is the Evangelical Party, which may be dated from that group in the reign of Edward VI who were not satisfied with the First Prayer Book of 1549 and organized themselves in opposition to it. This party continued during the reign of Elizabeth but gradually lost influence under Charles I and Charles II. It was invigorated somewhat by the Methodist Movement of John Wesley during the eighteenth century but steadily lost influence in the nineteenth century with the coming of the Oxford Movement and that of Biblical Criticism. In America the strength of this party has been principally in the South and in certain parts of the Middle West. Its seminaries have been those of Alexandria in Virginia and Bexley Hall in Ohio. Very recently, this party has tended to look favorably upon the movement known as Neo-Orthodoxy.

The High Church Party had its origin among those who in the reign of Queen Elizabeth upheld the teaching and rubrics of the Prayer Book against the growing Puritanism. It increased in influence under Charles I and Charles II, but steadily lost influence during the eighteenth century. The Oxford Movement of 1833 brought to it new life and vigor and it has continued to exercise a dominant power throughout the Anglican Communion, not only in matters of faith, but even more largely in ceremonial practice. It is safe to say that there are few churches anywhere in the Anglican Communion which have not been in some way affected by this ceremonial revival. The extreme wing of this party is now popularly known as the Anglo-Catholic Party and has made considerable contribution to the life of its Church. Under its leadership the monastic life for both men and women has been revived, with the result that there are numerous orders both for

men and women in every part of the Anglican Communion. Here in America at least four of our most distinguished Bishops have been monks and it is estimated that there are more nuns in the Anglican Communion now than there were in the Church of England at the dissolution under Henry VIII. Much of the increase of devotional life among Anglicans has been due to the influence of this group. I have in mind such practices as the weekly and in many cases daily Eucharist, the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, the frequent holding of Retreats and Quiet Days, and the better observance of fast days. The seminaries of this tendency have been especially Nashotah Seminary in Wisconsin and, to a considerable extent, the General Seminary in New York.

The third party has been known as the Broad Church Party and dates from the latter half of the seventeenth century. It was largely influenced by eighteenth-century Rationalism but made its greatest contribution in the nineteenth century by its enthusiastic upholding of the principles of Biblical Criticism. So successful has the party been along this line that in many cases it has ceased to function as a separate group and has been dissolved into the broader life of the Church as a whole. There has been comparatively little controversy over questions of the higher criticism in our American Church and this has been largely due to the effectiveness of the Broad Church contribution. The chief seminary of this party has been the School at Cambridge, Massachusetts.

These parties seem often to outsiders to represent almost three different kinds of religion, but the Anglican, rightly or wrongly, does not feel that this is the case. That there are certain differences could hardly be denied, but in most cases these differences are differences of emphasis rather than of contradiction. Practically all Anglicans for instance would agree that the sacraments are definitely means of grace, through the reception of which God's power and help come to the individual. Beyond this members of the different parties would unquestionably place differences of emphasis, but concerning the fact itself there would be little dispute. Equally, among Anglicans there is no such thing as an authorized doctrine of the atonement, and therefore all difference on this important point can be allotted to amicable disagreement.

VI

After all, the chief points in differentiation of any Communion are its ethos and its organization. From this standpoint, and in view of history, the position of the Anglican Church may be said to be fairly close to that of the leaders of the Reforming Councils of the fifteenth century and of the Eastern Orthodox Churches today. This has sometimes been described as a Catholicism without the Papacy, but this leaves out the friendliness of the

Anglican Church to any proved results of modern scholarship. Some of the firmest upholders of the Anglican position have been recognized as most advanced scholars, both in Biblical and in social matters. Hence, it would be necessary to add another word to the above definition, if it were used at all, and say that the Anglican position is that of an enlightened Catholicism without the Papacy.

VII

So far as social questions go, there has been and still is a sharp distinction between Anglican thought in England and in America. There can be little doubt that our American Church has contributed very little to the application of Christian principles to the problems of modern society. On the other hand, the English Church has manifested great interest and progress along these lines and especially under the leadership of the present Archbishop of Canterbury and his numerous supporters has taken definite stands on many social points. At the same time it is true to say that traditionally Anglicanism has tended to avoid coming out into the open on such problems. There is a small group here in America known as the Church League for Industrial Democracy, but its influence throughout the Episcopal Church has not, as yet, been marked.

VIII

Our Church in this country has long been interested in problems of Church Unity. As long ago as 1853 a resolution known as the Muhlenburg Memorial was introduced into our General Convention to feel out the possibility of unity with other Communions. Nothing very definite came of this Memorial, but in 1886 there was issued in Chicago what has come to be known, because of its later adoption by Lambeth, as the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral. This invited discussions toward unity with any group which would agree upon the basis of (1) the two creeds, (2) the Scriptures, (3) the two Sacraments, and (4) the historic Episcopate. Obviously, there were many loopholes in such a proposal, but it was put forth as at least the hope of the Anglican Church for possible discussions. In 1910 the General Convention created the commission on Faith and Order, which has done much to keep interest in unity alive, among both ourselves and others. In the last few years a commission on Approaches to Unity has been created and has entered into discussions with representatives of the Presbyterian Church. So far, little of concrete value has appeared as the result of these endeavors, but they do manifest the desire for fellowship with all disciples of our Lord.

In all questions of unity we feel that the two foci of authority, on the one hand, and of freedom on the other, must equally be kept in mind. Practically, all religious enterprises of Christendom may be subsumed under one

or the other of these two poles of thought. In the Bible and in the history of the Church, there is a genuine element of historic and social authority. Equally, in the Bible and in the development of the Church we find a strong emphasis on freedom. Various Communions have sacrificed one or the other of these points for efficiency. The Roman Church has exalted authority to the extreme minimizing of freedom. The unhappy story of the silencing of the most distinguished Roman Catholic scholars during the last half century is a sad testimony to this. On the other hand, the Protestant groups by their breach with the historic and socially organized Christianity at the time of the Reformation seem to us to have sacrificed authority for the exercise of freedom. It is the hope of many Anglicans that their Communion may be able to justify the title sometimes ascribed to it as the Bridge Church. By our historic continuity with the Church of the ages, we feel that we have Catholic authority to give to the Church of the future. By our ingrained spirit of liberty and freedom, we feel very akin to all devotees of freedom.

In any case our hope for the Ecumenical Church of the future is that to it each present Communion shall make contribution from its own experience of God. We want everyone to give but no one to give up. This enlarged religious horizon is very difficult to make popular among the inherited prejudices of centuries. It is, however, the only basis upon which we can visualize any unity which is worthy of the name of Christ. Both for ourselves and for others, we are flatly against any idea of the Church which would cause any religious experience to be discarded or discounted. We are enthusiastically in favor of a Church which will comprehend and synthesize all experience.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH

By FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER

I

MOST Presbyterians still accept the general statements of the Westminster Confession of Faith concerning the Church (Ch. XXV, Sections I and II): "The catholic or universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all. The visible Church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel (not confined to one nation, as before under the

law), consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."

When, therefore, the question is asked, in what sense Christ founded the Church, account must be taken of the fact that even before his Incarnation the Logos, both directly and mediately, in theophanies and through men specially endowed and led by the Holy Spirit, exercised his prophetic, priestly, and kingly functions in calling, instructing, and sanctifying Israel as the chosen people of God. As the Word Incarnate, Christ became the mediator of a new, a more generous, and a more comprehensive covenant of grace, when he chose a group of disciples to be the spiritual nucleus of a society which, though continuous with the ancient congregation of the Lord, consisted of members dominated by the sense of their peculiar relation to him as the divinely appointed Messiah and to one another as fellow-believers in him. By what he said, by what he did, and most of all by what he was — by the totality of his work and of his personal influence during his earthly ministry and thereafter through his gift of the Holy Spirit — Jesus created a brotherhood which, though it was essentially a spiritual organism, was bound, in promoting its welfare and discharging its obligations, to try to secure the benefits of a suitable organization. Though he gave no explicit directions about the polity and government of the Church, he nevertheless determined some of the distinctive features of its corporate life: he appointed an official ministry and instituted two sacraments.

II

Presbyterians believe that the essential elements of their ecclesiastical organization are found in the New Testament. A distinction is made between the extraordinary or temporary officers of the primitive Church — such as Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets — and the "ordinary and perpetual officers": the "Bishops or Pastors; the representatives of the people, usually styled Ruling Elders; and Deacons." It is maintained that in the Apostolic Age, and for a considerable period thereafter, the terms "bishop" and "elder" were used interchangeably as designations of different ministerial functions rather than as names of distinct officers. And stress is still laid on the parity of the ministry, the conviction being that there is only one clerical "order." As in other communions, new forms of organization have been created to meet changing conditions and to secure greater efficiency in administration. It is not claimed that there is any New Testament prototype for these developments, but only that they are in harmony with the fundamental principle of the polity: it is "expedient, and agreeable to Scripture

and the practice of the primitive Christians, that the Church be governed by congregational, presbyterial, and synodical assemblies."

III

The Church is a fellowship of "saints" in the New Testament sense of the term, — those whom God calls out of the world and Christ redeems and the Holy Spirit sanctifies, that they may become progressively holy as partakers of salvation in the Kingdom of God. The Church Invisible, as has been stated, consists of all the elect, the redeemed of all ages and all lands; and the Church Visible, of all who profess the true religion, together with their children. Thus "the Church" represents a much greater multitude than the group with which a particular congregation may be "in communion" in the common use of this phrase.

Children of believing parents, that is parents who have made a credible profession of their faith, are by right of birth members of the Church and as such are entitled to receive baptism as the sign and seal of their covenant privileges. Persons who have attained years of discretion are admitted to church membership by the session on profession of faith in Christ, and by baptism if this sacrament was not administered in infancy. Members are also received by the session by letters of recommendation from other Churches. The session also has the power to exclude unworthy members, but only in accordance with the constitutional discipline.

IV

Christ is and ever will be the one and only Head and Lord of the Church. The relation between him and the Church is of so vital and indeed so unique a character that without him the Church could never have come into being or have continued to exist. The Church is his body, drawing its very life from him and in turn serving him as the members of the body serve the governing head. By his efficacious grace he quickens with spiritual life men dead in trespasses and sins, and by his Word and sacraments he nourishes and enriches this new creation and transforms it into his own likeness.

In one sense of the term, therefore, the Church cannot be the "continuation of the Incarnation," for though the Church may fittingly be personified — as in the metaphor of "the spouse of Christ" — she is not a person in the same sense in which he is a person who is the primary because the divine Author and Giver of life. The vague expression is not much used in Presbyterian circles, and at most it is accepted only as a figurative statement that the Church seeks to make known by word and deed the redemptive significance of the Incarnation.

The Church is a "voluntary society" in the sense that Christians freely

choose to profess their faith in Christ. They "voluntarily" associate together for "divine worship and godly living." But in Calvinistic doctrine the really significant fact is that faith itself is a gift of God, and that only when sinners are made willing — by the recreating act of divine grace — to accept the offer of salvation made in the gospel do they become members of the redeemed society, the communion of the faithful.

The Church is a "fellowship ruled by the Spirit," for only when Christ is present by his Spirit does the Church have the power to bring forth the "fruit of the Spirit," the manifold graces of the renewed life. Again the Calvinist would place the emphasis on the divine activity of the Spirit in our communion with him rather than on the sinner's endeavor to "live in the spirit or by the example of Christ."

V

The Presbyterian, like other evangelical Churches, regards the gospel, the good news of salvation through Christ Jesus, as the very essence of its "message." Among the many scriptural passages that are sometimes cited as summary statements of the central truths to be emphasized, that in II Corinthians 5:19 is deemed specially serviceable: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses. . . ." The doctrines of God, man, and the God-man are bound to have a basal and cardinal significance. But the ethical implications of these teachings, both for the individual Christian and for the Church, are likewise "essential." The new life of the believer must be continually adjusted to the divine will as revealed in the law and the gospel, if it is to fulfill its obligations and realize its highest possibilities in the worship of God and the loving service of men. As one of the Presbyterian Standards puts the matter: "Truth is in order to goodness; and the great touchstone of truth, its tendency to promote holiness; according to our Saviour's rule, 'by their fruits ye shall know them' " (F. G., I, iv).

The mission of the Church is that of proclaiming the gospel to all the world with a view to making disciples of all the nations and teaching them the will of God as revealed in Christ Jesus. But preaching "Jesus Christ, and him crucified" must be conceived in the comprehensive fashion exemplified by Paul himself in the context in which this phrase occurs and in his letters as a whole. The work of the Church will thus include evangelism, home and foreign missions, Christian education, the training and maintenance of an adequate ministry, care for needy members, and, in general, the promotion of the Kingdom of God and its righteousness in the local community and throughout the world. The mission is accomplished, in reliance upon the promises of God, through the proper use of the means of grace — the Word,

the sacraments, private prayer and public worship — and by the faithful discharge of the trust imposed by the divine Task-giver.

VI

The world as God's creation and as a realm of his providential activity is filled with tokens of his benevolence to all who can discern and rightly employ the gifts of his common grace. But the world as the dominion of fallen and depraved mankind is involved in enmity and rebellion against God. On the one hand, therefore, the Church must perpetually war against the evil that is in the world, and never become ensnared by its pleasures, corrupted by its riches, or led astray by its false standards. While the Presbyterian Church "has no elaborate schedule of worldly actions which are to be avoided," its General Assembly does from time to time warn against specific current dangers. But on the other hand, the Church, besides keeping herself unspotted from the world and waging war against every form of evil, must make known the truth of God, in judgment and mercy, for the salvation of the world. "In the Gospel God declares His love for the world and His desire that all men should be saved . . .; promises eternal life to all who truly repent and believe in Christ; invites and commands all to embrace the offered mercy; and by His Spirit accompanying the Word pleads with men to accept His gracious invitation" (Conf. XXXV).

The Church honors the state as a divinely appointed social institute charged with the responsibility of securing and maintaining the public peace and order. The civil magistrate may lawfully use the sword "for the defense and encouragement of them that are good and for the punishment of evil doers." Christians may lawfully "wage war upon just and necessary occasions." But Church and state should be kept separate. Civil magistrates "may not assume to themselves the administration of the Word and Sacraments; or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; or, in the least, interfere in matters of faith." Christians should pray for their magistrates, obey their lawful commands, and by every means in their power promote the public welfare. The Church as such should not try to control the state, but as the divinely appointed witness to the truth of God's Word it should apply the message of salvation to the civic and political as well as to all the other duties of its members. Church and state are both subject to the sovereign will of God, and when a Christian is convinced that the state is hostile to his freedom in Christ, he is bound to obey God rather than men.

The Church is both the organ and the object of the Kingdom of God, considered not as his eternal power but as his gracious reign in human life. The Church at any given time is his kingdom in so far as its members acknowledge the Lordship of God in Christ, and in turn the reign of God in his ever-expanding kingdom aims at the accomplishment of the number of

his elect, who will constitute the Church Triumphant and as such be partakers of the Kingdom of glory. Doubtless, to most readers of the New Testament the term "Kingdom" is more suggestive of the social values of the gospel than is the term "Church," but as a matter of fact the duties of the Church are precisely those that must be performed if the Kingdom of God is to be in any true sense a reality in this present age and not a mere hope for the eternal future.

VII

The Presbyterian Church considers that it maintains "the continuity of the true Church of Christ" by preaching the gospel in its purity and fulness, by administering the sacraments according to his direction, by maintaining a properly qualified ministry to lead in the witness, worship, and work of the Church, by promoting Christian fellowship among its members and with other Churches, and, in general, by striving faithfully to realize, within the measure of its opportunities and its enduement for service, the divine purpose of making the "kingdom of the world" become "the kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ." Presbyterians do not use the term "apostolic succession" and do not accept the theory commonly associated with it; but they believe that they share with other Christian bodies a great spiritual and ecclesiastical heritage descending from the days of the Apostles. They hold that their ministry is in the truly evangelical succession because it is duly qualified and set apart to the sacred office by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, according to what they consider the Apostolic practice. The ordination authenticates the minister to the people, not because it *ipso facto* imparts a special grace to him, but because it publicly attests the judgment of the constitutional authorities that he is worthy of the trust committed to him.

VIII

Among the more significant changes that have taken place in the thought and life of most of our Presbyterian Churches during the last one hundred years one of the most obvious is the growth of an ecumenical spirit. There is manifestly an increasing desire for closer fellowship with other Churches, for organic union with kindred groups, for more effective co-operation in domestic and foreign missions, and for the development of interdenominational activities to meet the special needs of metropolitan centers and rural areas. The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America is a member of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches Throughout the World Holding the Presbyterian System, of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and of the World Council of Churches. As already indicated, there has been a considerable expansion of ecclesiastical organization

on account of the enlarged membership and the geographical extension of the Church, — a change that has been accompanied by a rather questionable concentration of official power, especially in the Boards and the higher judicatories. The ruling elder, less conversant than he used to be with the doctrine and polity of his Church, has lost official prestige and become too often quite unable or unwilling to make his proper contribution to the efficiency of a republican form of church government. In harmony with the general tendency in our American life there has been an increased activity of women in nearly every kind of church work; in recent years they have become eligible for membership in our Boards and in the session.

In many quarters there is a keener interest in liturgical matters, the desire being to secure greater dignity, variety, beauty, and spiritual effectiveness in public worship. The Presbyterian, like other Churches, has become more conscious of the social implications of the gospel and of the necessity of giving them a more adequate presentation in the curriculum of the theological seminary, in the pulpit, and in the Bible school. Christian instruction in the home has suffered a rather general decline, and it is to be feared that what is being offered as a panacea for this and our other ecclesiastical ills under the pathetically vague term of "religious education" is neither pedagogically nor spiritually as helpful as it ought to be. Like other Churches, the Presbyterian has felt the blight of modernism and is suffering from a resulting intellectual confusion and uncertainty. On the other hand, the few but important changes in the standards have commended themselves to the great majority of Presbyterians as evidences of progress toward a better-balanced, because a more truly evangelical, theology. This is especially true of the heightened emphasis on the love of God and the missionary obligations of the Church. Indeed, the widespread and sustained interest in the question of the nature and function of the Church is itself one of the most significant facts in our denominational thinking in recent decades.

IX

The Presbyterian Churches, because of their medial position between Protestants on the right and the left extremes, have no contributions to make to the Church Universal that may not be largely matched by those of other groups. But they feel that what merit their service to the cause of Christ may have has been due chiefly to their loyalty to the Word of God and to evangelical doctrine; their representative form of government, combining corporate authority with individual freedom; the simplicity and spirituality of their public worship; their insistence on thorough training for their ministers, their promotion of education in general, and their recognition of the claims of the intellect in the defense and propagation of the

faith; their evangelistic and more especially their missionary work; and their advocacy of a disciplined ethical earnestness.

Among the parts of our total Christian heritage that Presbyterians may well appropriate more thoroughly is the mystical element in Christianity that would serve to balance the traditional and sometimes one-sided emphasis on the rational and moral factors. Many Presbyterians feel that their polity, in spite of its many excellencies, must more satisfactorily solve the problem of settling and transferring pastors. Outstanding among the desiderata is a more thorough grounding of our children and youth in the knowledge of the Bible and the principles of our faith and polity. And in the fundamental matter of the Church's witness there is need of the revival of the sense of personal responsibility for sin and its baleful consequences, and of the sovereign grace of God as the prime requisite for the regeneration of the individual and the reconstruction of society.

INDEX, VOLUME IX (1944)

Articles

American Lutherans at the Crossroads, by O. H. Pannkoke, 354.
British Churches Look Ahead, The, by Cecil Northcott, 438.
Christian Conscience and the Crisis of Color, The, by Buell Gordon Gallagher, 476.
Christian Gospel Embassy, The, by John Clark Archer, 336.
Christianity and the Churches in Latin America, by Luis Alberto Sánchez, 40.
Christianity and the Influence of the Soviet Union, by Cyril K. Gloyn, 153.
Church as the Body of Christ, The, by W. Norman Pittenger, 202.
Church Order and the Historic Episcopate, by Theodore O. Wedel, 449.
Convictions and the Judgment of the Church, by Abdel Ross Wentz, 195.
Depth, by Paul Tillich, 317.
Dramatic Approach to Christianity, A, by Gordon E. Michalson, 462.
Emergency Co-operation and Permanent Church Practice, by Mark A. Dawber, 214.
Fourteenth Century Social Gospel, A, by David Stowe, 88.
Guilt: by George A. Coe, 172.
How To Conduct A Controversy, by George M. Gibson, 302.
Japan in the Post-War World, by Fred D. Gealy, 77.
Missionary Message Since Madras, The, by Henry P. Van Dusen, 22.
Natural Law and International Order, by Walter M. Horton, 2.
Natural Law and the Nature of Man, by Paul Ramsey, 369.
Russia and the Ecumenical Movement, by Paul B. Anderson, 505.
Our American Theological Heritage, by Hugh Thomson Kerr, Jr., 344.
Philosophy of Church Co-operation, The, by Ross W. Sanderson, 489.
Portrait of an Internationalist, by Julius Seelye Bixler, 35.
Preface to Religious Pluralism, A, by Stewart G. Cole and Bernard Heller, 69.
Protestantism's Inner Conflict, by William Clayton Bower, 290.
Re-education of the Home Church, The, by Luman J. Shafer, 60.
Religious Liberty, by F. Ernest Johnson, 181.
Results of an Ecumenical Study, by John C. Bennett, 142.
Toward a Valid Sacramentalism, by Roger Hazelton, 226.
Younger Churches Re-think Missions, The, by T. T. Lew, 50.
Youth and the Ecumenical Movement, by Clifford T. Symons, 326.

Contributors of Articles

Anderson, Paul B.: Russia and the Ecumenical Movement, 505.
Archer, John Clark: The Christian Gospel Embassy, 336.
Bennett, John C.: Results of an Ecumenical Study, 142.
Bixler, Julius Seelye: Portrait of an Internationalist, 35.
Bower, William Clayton: Protestantism's Inner Conflict, 290.
Coe, George A.: Guilt, 172.
Cole, Stewart G. (and Bernard Heller): A Preface to Religious Pluralism, 69.
Dawber, Mark A.: Emergency Co-operation and Permanent Church Practice, 214.
Gallagher, Buell Gordon: The Christian Conscience and the Crisis of Color, 476.
Gealy, Fred D.: Japan in the Post-War World, 77.
Gibson, George M.: How To Conduct A Controversy, 302.
Gloyn, Cyril K.: Christianity and the Influence of the Soviet Union, 153.
Hazelton, Roger: Toward a Valid Sacramentalism, 226.
Heller, Bernard (and Stewart G. Cole): A Preface to Religious Pluralism, 69.
Horton, Walter M.: Natural Law and International Order, 2.
Johnson, F. Ernest: Religious Liberty, 181.
Kerr, Hugh Thomson, Jr.: Our American Theological Heritage, 344.
Lew, T. T.: The Younger Churches Re-think Missions, 50.
Michalson, Gordon E.: A Dramatic Approach to Christianity, 462.
Northcott, Cecil: The British Churches Look Ahead, 438.
Pannkoke, O. H.: American Lutherans at the Crossroads, 354.
Pittenger, W. Norman: The Church as the Body of Christ, 202.
Ramsey, Paul: Natural Law and the Nature of Man, 369.
Sánchez, Luis Alberto: Christianity and the Churches in Latin America, 40.
Sanderson, Ross W.: The Philosophy of Church Co-operation, 489.
Shafer, Luman J.: The Re-education of the Home Church, 60.
Stowe, David: A Fourteenth Century Social Gospel, 88.
Symons, Clifford T.: Youth and the Ecumenical Movement, 326.
Tillich, Paul: Depth, 317.
Van Dusen, Henry P.: The Missionary Message Since Madras, 22.
Wedel, Theodore O.: Church Order and the Historic Episcopate, 449.
Wentz, Abdel Ross: Convictions and the Judgment of the Church, 195.

Litany and Affirmation

A Charter for Christian Youth, 437.
A Prayer of St. Nerses, 141.
(From the Ancient Armenian Book of Office and Divine Liturgy.)
Prayers for an Hour of Crisis, 289, 325.
Prayer of Commemoration for William Paton, 1.

Reports and Papers — American Theological Committee

Barclay, William (and Richard Davidson): Conceptions of the Church held by the United and Presbyterian Churches of Canada, 429.

Cadbury, Henry J.: Conceptions of the Church held by Quakers, 559.
Carver, W. O.: Conceptions of the Church held by Baptists, 548.
Craig, Clarence T., Report on the Study of the Church, 270.
Davidson, Richard (and William Barclay): Conceptions of the Church held by the United and Presbyterian Churches of Canada, 429.
Garrison, Winfred E.: Conceptions of the Church held by the Disciples of Christ, 433.
Horton, Walter M.: Conceptions of the Church held by the Congregational Christian Churches, 424.
Lewis, Leicester C.: Conceptions of the Church held by Anglicans, 565.
Loetscher, Frederick W.: Conceptions of the Church held by Presbyterians, 573.
Richards, George W.: Historical Preface, 262; Conceptions of the Church held by the Evangelical and Reformed Churches, 409.
Slabaugh, Warren W.: Conceptions of the Church held by the Church of the Brethren, 556.
Wahlstrom, Eric H.: Conceptions of the Church held by the Lutheran Churches, 417.

Books Reviewed

Adamic, Louis: My Native Land, 247.
Altar and the World, The, by Bernard Iddings Bell, 546.
American Jewish Year Book, The, 5704. Volume 45. Edited for the American Jewish Committee by Harry Schneiderman, editor, and Morris T. Fine, assistant editor, 260.
American Society in War Time, edited by William F. Ogburn, 258.
Anderson, William K., editor: Protestantism, 539.
Anglican Evangelism, edited by Alexander C. Zabriskie, 390.
Anglicanism and South India, by Leonard Hodgson, 134.
Batten, J. Minton: John Dury, 525.
Beginning from Within, by Douglas V. Steere, 535.
Beginning of Christianity, The, by Clarence Tucker Craig, 236.
Bell, Bernard Iddings: The Altar and the World, 546.
Berdyaev, Nicholas: Slavery and Freedom, 520.
Bernanos, Georges: Plea for Liberty, 528.
Bettenson, Henry, selected and edited by: Documents of the Christian Church, 403.
Beyond the Dark, by Elmore M. McKee, 544.
Boodin, John Elof: Religion of Tomorrow, 110.
Bower, William Clayton: Church and State in Education, 394.
Bratton, Fred G.: The Legacy of the Liberal Spirit, 242.
Bringing up Ourselves, by Helen G. Hogue, 250.
Brown, Charles R.: Dreams Come True, 544.
Brunner, Emil: The Divine-Human Encounter, 98.
Buckner, George Walter, Jr.: Concerns of a World Church, 135.
Burckhardt, Jacob: Force and Freedom. Reflections on History, edited by James Hastings Nichols, 135.
Burma Diary, by Paul Geren, 245.
Cadoux, C. J.: The Historic Mission of Jesus: A Constructive Re-Examination of the Eschatological Teaching of the Synoptic Gospels, 100.
Cailliet, Emile: The Clue to Pascal, 398.
Carpenter, J. Henry: Peace Through Cooperation, 527.
Case for Christianity, The, by C. S. Lewis, 116.
Challenge of Israel's Faith, The, by G. Ernest Wright, 400.
Chamberlin, William Henry: The Russian Enigma, An Interpretation, 254.
Changing Emphases in American Preaching, by Ernest Trice Thompson, 240.
China's Religious Heritage, by Y. C. Yang, 104.
Choose Ye This Day, by Elmer G. Homrighausen, 246.
Creative Delivery of Sermons, The, by Robert White Kirkpatrick, 407.
Christian Counter Attack, by Hugh Martin, Douglas Newton, H. M. Waddams, R. R. Williams, 522.
Christianity and Civilization, by H. G. Wood, 133.
Christianity and the Contemporary Scene, edited by Randolph Crump Miller and Henry H. Shires, 390.
Christianity and Democracy, by Jacques Maritain, 542.
Church and Psychotherapy, The, by Karl R. Stalz, 130.
Church and State in Education, by William Clayton Bower, 394.
Clark, Thomas Curtis: God's Dreams, 396.
Clue to Pascal, The, by Emile Cailliet, 398.
Comfort, W.: William Penn, 402.
Companion to the Communion Service, A. A devotional manual, by W. Robinson, 136.
Compend of Luther's Theology, A, edited by Hugh Thompson Kerr, Jr., 109.
Concerns of a World Church, by George Walter Buckner, Jr., 135.
Condition of Man, The, by Lewis Mumford, 517.
Confessions of St. Augustine, The, translated by F. J. Sheed, 260.
Contemporary Thinking About Jesus, compiled by Thomas S. Kepler, 519.
Craig, Clarence Tucker: The Beginning of Christianity, 236.
Date With Destiny, by Ralph W. Sockman, 536.
Divine-Human Encounter, The, by Emil Brunner, 98.
Doctrine of the Trinity, The, by Leonard Hodgson, 516.
Documents of the Christian Church, selected and edited by Henry Bettenson, 403.
Dr. Rudolph Bolling Teusler — An Adventure in Christianity, by Howard Chandler Robbins and George K. MacNaught, 256.
Dreams Come True, by Charles R. Brown, 544.
Earliest Gospel, The. Studies of the Evangelic Tradition at Its Point of Crystallization in Writing, by Frederick C. Grant, 112.
Eddy, Sherwood: A Portrait of Jesus, A Twentieth Century Interpretation of Christ, 251.
Education at the Crossroads, by Jacques Maritain, 126.
Embree, Edwin R.: Thirteen Against the Odds, 388.
Exiled Pilgrim, by William Hubben, 244.
Farmer, Herbert H.: Towards Belief in God, 121.
Filson, Floyd V.: One Lord — One Faith, 105.
Fine, Morris T., assistant editor: The American Jewish Year Book, 5704, Vol. 45, edited for the American Jewish Committee with Harry Schneiderman, editor, 260.
Fisher, W. B. H.: Frederick Bohn Fisher; World Citizen, 399.
Force and Freedom. Reflections on History, by Jacob Burckhardt, edited by James Hastings Nichols, 135.
Frederick Bohn Fisher; World Citizen, by W. B. H. Fisher, 399.
Geren, Paul: Burma Diary, 245.
Gilkey, James Gordon: God Will Help You, 259.
Glory of God, Poems and Prayers for Devotional Use, The, by Georgia Harkness, 134.
God's Dreams, by Thomas Curtis Clark, 396.
God Will Help You, by James Gordon Gilkey, 259.

Grant, Frederick C.: The Earliest Gospel. Studies of the Evangelic Tradition at Its Point of Crystallization in Writing, 112.
Great Century in Northern Africa and in Asia, The, by Kenneth Scott Latourette, 389.
Harkness, Georgia: The Glory of God, Poems and Prayers for Devotional Use, 134.
Hayman, Eric: Worship and the Common Life, 546.
Heard, Gerald: A Preface to Prayer, 384.
Hewitt, Arthur Wentworth: Jerusalem the Golden, 533.
Historic Mission of Jesus, The: A Constructive Re-examination of the Eschatological Teaching of the Synoptic Gospels, by C. J. Cadoux, 100.
History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea, A, by William, Archbishop of Tyre, 406.
Hodgson, Leonard: Anglicanism and South India, 134; The Doctrine of The Trinity, 516.
Hogue, Helen G.: Bringing up Ourselves, 250.
Homrighausen, Elmer G.: Choose Ye This Day, 246.
Horton, Walter Marshall: Theology in Transition, 123.
How Do We Know God? by Richard Kramer, 106.
Hubben, William: Exiled Pilgrim, 244.
In Quest of a Kingdom, by Leslie E. Weatherhead, 544.
In Search of Maturity, by Fritz Kunkel, 130.
Iswolsky, Helen: Soul of Russia, 254.
Jerusalem the Golden, by Arthur Wentworth Hewitt, 533.
John Dury, by J. Minton Batten, 525.
Johnson, F. Ernest (ed.): Religion and the World Order, 524.
Jones, Rufus M.: The Radiant Life, 535.
Kelsen, Hans: Society and Nature: A Sociological Inquiry, 404.
Kepler, Thomas S. (compiled by): Contemporary Thinking About Jesus, 519.
Kerr, Hugh Thompson, Jr. (ed.): A Compend of Luther's Theology, 109.
Kirkpatrick, Robert White: The Creative Delivery of Sermons, 407.
Knudson, Albert C.: The Principles of Christian Ethics, 119.
Komroff, Manuel: The One Story: The Life of Christ, Arranged from the Four Gospels, 251.
Kroner, Richard: How Do We Know God?, 106; The Primacy of Faith, 106.
Kunkel, Fritz: In Search of Maturity, 130.
Ladder of Progress in Palestine, The. A Story of Archaeological Adventure, by Chester Charlton McCown, 238.
Latourette, Kenneth Scott: The Great Century in Northern Africa and in Asia, 389.
Legacy of the Liberal Spirit, The, by Fred G. Bratton, 242.
Lewis, C. S.: The Case for Christianity, 116; The Problem of Pain, 249.
Life's Unanswered Questions, by Harold Cooke Phillips, 536.
Lilienthal, David E.: TVA — Democracy on the March, 531.
Live, Love and Learn, by Joseph Fort Newton, 259.
Living Abundantly, by Kirby Page, 543.
Lonely Midas: The Story of Stephen Girard, by Harry Emerson Wildes, 253.
Lowrie, Walter: The Short Story of Jesus, 397.
MacNaught, George K.: Dr. Rudolph Bolling Teusler — An Adventure in Christianity, with Howard Chandler Robbins, 256.
Maritain Jacques: Christianity and Democracy, 542; Education at the Crossroads, 126; The Rights of Man and Natural Law, 132.
Martin, Hugh: Christian Counter Attack, with Newton, Douglas; Waddams, H. M.; and Williams, R. R., 522.
McCown, Chester Charlton: The Ladder of Progress in Palestine. A Story of Archaeological Adventure, 238.
McKee, Elmore M.: Beyond the Dark, 544.
Miller, Randolph Crump (ed.): Christianity and the Contemporary Scene, with Henry H. Shires, 390.
Moffatt, James: The Thrill of Tradition, 534.
Mumford, Lewis: The Condition of Man, 517.
My Native Land, by Louis Adamic, 247.
Newton, Douglas: Christian Counter Attack, with Martin, Hugh; Waddams, H. M.; and Williams, R. R., 522.
Newton, Joseph Fort: Live, Love and Learn, 259.
Nichols, James Hastings (ed.): Force and Freedom. Reflections on History, by Jacob Burckhardt, 135.
Noyes, Morgan Phelps: Preaching the Word of God, 125.
Ogburn, William F.: American Society in War Time, 258.
One Lord — One Faith, by Floyd V. Filson, 105.
One Story, The: The Life of Christ, Arranged from the Four Gospels, by Manuel Komroff, 251.
Page, Kirby: Living Abundantly, 543.
Path to Perfection, The, by W. E. Sangster, 386.
Peace Through Cooperation, by J. Henry Carpenter, 527.
Peers, E. Allison: The Spirit of Flame, 392.
Phillips, Harold Cooke: Life's Unanswered Questions, 536.
Philosophy of the Christian World Mission, The, by Edmund D. Soper, 101.
Plea for Liberty, by Georges Bernanos, 528.
Poladian, Terenig (compiled and translated by): Prayers from the Ancient Armenian Book of Office and Divine Liturgy, 261.
Portrait of Jesus, A Twentieth Century Interpretation of Christ, A, by Sherwood Eddy, 251.
Prayers from the Ancient Armenian Book of Office and Divine Liturgy, compiled and translated by Terenig Poladian, 261.
Preaching the Word of God, by Morgan Phelps Noyes, 125.
Preface to Prayer, A, by Gerald Heard, 384.
Primacy of Faith, The, by Richard Kroner, 106.
Principles of Christian Ethics, The, by Albert C. Knudson, 119.
Problem of Pain, The, by C. S. Lewis, 249.
Protestantism, edited by William K. Anderson, 539.
Radiant Life, The, by Rufus M. Jones, 535.
Raven, Charles Earle: Science, Religion and the Future, 129.
Rebuilding Our World, Wartime Sermons in the Harvard College Chapel, by Willard L. Sperry, 237.
Religion and Empire, by Louis B. Wright, 115.
Religion and the World Order, edited by F. Ernest Johnson, 524.
Religion of Tomorrow, by John Elof Boodin, 110.
Revivalism in America, by William Warren Sweet, 538.
Rights of Man and Natural Law, The, by Jacques Maritain, translated by Doris C. Anson, 132.
Robbins, Howard Chandler: Dr. Rudolph Bolling Teusler — An Adventure in Christianity, with George K. MacNaught, 256.
Robinson, W.: A Companion to the Communion Service. A Devotional Manual, 136.
Russian Enigma, An Interpretation, The, by William Henry Chamberlin, 254.
Sangster, W. E.: The Path to Perfection, 386.
Schneiderman, Harry (ed.): The American Jewish Year Book, 5704. Vol. 45. Edited for the American Jewish Committee, with Morris T. Fine, assistant editor, 260.
Science, Religion and the Future, by Charles Earle Raven, 129.

Scott, Ernest F.: The Varieties of New Testament Religion, 241.
Sharman, Henry Burton: Son of Man and Kingdom of God, 111.
Sheed, F. J. (translated by): The Confessions of St. Augustine, 260.
Shires, Henry H. (ed.): Christianity and the Contemporary Scene, with Randolph Crump Miller, 390.
Short Story of Jesus, The, by Walter Lowrie, 397.
Slavery and Freedom, by Nicholas Berdyaev, 520.
Society and Nature: A Sociological Inquiry, by Hans Kelsen, 404.
Sockman, Ralph W.: Date With Destiny, 536.
Son of Man and Kingdom of God, by Henry Burton Sharman, 111.
Soper, Edmund D.: The Philosophy of the Christian World Mission, 101.
Soul of Russia, by Helen Iswolsky, 254.
Sperry, Willard L.: Rebuilding Our World, Wartime Sermons in the Harvard College Chapel, 237.
Spirit of Flame, The, by E. Allison Peers, 392.
Steere, Douglas V.: Beginning from Within, 535.
Stolz, Karl R.: The Church and Psychotherapy, 130.
Sweet, William Warren: Revivalism in America, 538.
Theology in Transition, by Walter Marshall Horton, 123.
Thirteen Against the Odds, by Edwin R. Embree, 388.
Thomas, George F., Ed. The Vitality of the Christian Tradition, 382.
Thompson, Ernest Trice: Changing Emphases in American Preaching, 240.
Thrill of Tradition, The, by James Moffatt, 534.
Tolstoy, Leo: What Men Live By, 260.
Towards Belief in God, by Herbert H. Farmer, 121.
TVA — Democracy on the March, by David E. Lilienthal, 531.
Varieties of New Testament Religion, The, by Ernest F. Scott, 241.
Vitality of the Christian Tradition, The, edited by George F. Thomas, 382.
Waddams, H. M.: Christian Counter Attack, with Martin, Hugh; Newton, Douglas; and Williams, R. R., 522.
Weatherhead, Leslie E.: In Quest of a Kingdom, 544.
What Men Live By, by Leo Tolstoy, 260.
Wildes, Harry Emerson: Lonely Midas: The Story of Stephen Girard, 253.
William, Archbishop of Tyre: A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea, 406.
William Penn, by W. Comfort, 402.
Wood, H. G.: Christianity and Civilization, 133.
Word of God and the Reformed Faith, The. Grand Rapids, Michigan, Baker's Book Store, 124.
Worship and the Common Life, by Eric Hayman, 546.
Wright, G. Ernest: The Challenge of Israel's Faith, 400.
Wright, Louis B.: Religion and Empire, 115.
Yang, Y. C.: China's Religious Heritage, 104.
Zabriskie, Alexander C., Ed.: Anglican Evangelism, 390.

Reviewers

Abernathy, Bradford S., 247.
Aubrey, Edwin E., 110, 249.
Bainton, Roland H., 406.
Bergendoff, Conrad, 109.
Bennett, John C., 121, 382, 546.
Berkeley, James P., 400.
Beth, Carl E., 129.
Bosley, Harold, 535.
Braden, Charles S., 104.
Branscomb, Harvie, 112.
Brightman, Edgar Sheffield, 520.
Brown, William Adams, 106.
Brush, John Woolman, 402.
Burrows, Millar, 238.
Dabbs, James McBride, 396.
Dabney, Vaughan, 240, 394.
Deems, Mervin M., 525.
Douglass, Harlan Paul, 132, 258, 538.
Easton, Burton Scott, 105.
Emrich, Richard, 390.
Filson, Floyd V., 241.
Fleming, Daniel J., 245.
Foster, Lloyd E., 536.
Gallagher, Buell G., 388.
Grant, Frederick C., 236.
Hamilton, Clarence H., 101.
Hiltner, Seward, 130, 250.
Horton, Walter Marshall, 519.
Hough, Lynn Harold, 237.
Hume, Edward H., 256.
Huntress, Erminie, 244.
Johnson, F. Ernest, 126, 542.
Edgar DeWitt Jones, 544.
Kennedy, Gerald, 125.
Knox, John, 111.
Leiper, Henry S., 522.
Lindeman, Eduard C., 404, 517.
McConnell, Francis J., 399.
McCown, C. C., 100.
Nolde, O. Frederick, 524.
Obenhaus, Victor, 531.
Palmer, Albert W., 407.
Pauck, Wilhelm, 398.
Pittenger, W. Norman, 123.
Ramsey, Paul, 119.
Richards, J. McDowell, 246.
Roberts, David E., 516.
Schroeder, John C., 242, 543.
Schubert, Paul, 397.
Shafer, L. J., 389.
Smith, W. Lyndon, 115.
Speer, Robert E., 533.
Sperry, W. L., 384.
Spinka, Matthew, 124, 254.
Steere, Douglas V., 392.
Tomkins, Floyd, 534.
Trueblood, D. Elton, 116.
Van Dusen, Henry P., 133.
Vernon, Ambrose White, 253.
Wedel, Theodore O., 539.
Wieman, Henry Nelson, 98.
Wilder, Amos N., 251, 528.
Williams, Daniel D., 386.
Zabriskie, Alexander C., 403.
Ziegler, Edward K., 527.

18,052

1914